```
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
07:38:54
         1
                         FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
         2
                                 MARSHALL DIVISION
         3
           UNITED SERVICES AUTOMOBILE ) (
           ASSOCIATION
                                         ) ( CIVIL ACTION NO.
         4
         5
           VS.
                                         ) ( 2:18-CV-366-JRG
         6
                                         ) ( MARSHALL, TEXAS
                                               JANUARY 6, 2020
         7
           WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A. ) ( 9:49 A.M.
         8
         9
                     TRANSCRIPT OF VOIR DIRE OF THE JURY PANEL
                                   MORNING SESSION
        10
        11
                BEFORE THE HONORABLE CHIEF JUDGE RODNEY GILSTRAP,
        12
                            UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
        13
           APPEARANCES:
        14
        15
          FOR THE PLAINTIFF:
        16
           JASON SHEASBY
           ANTHONY ROWLES
        17
           LISA GLASSER
        18
           IRELL & MANELLA
           1800 Avenue of the Stars
        19
           Suite 900
           Los Angeles, CA 90067-4276
        20
        21
           ROBERT CHRISTOPHER BUNT
        22
           PARKER, BUNT & AINSWORTH, PC
            100 East Ferguson
        23
           Suite 418
           Tyler, TX 75702
        24
        25
```

```
1
   FOR THE DEFENDANT:
 2
   THOMAS M. MELSHEIMER
   M. BRETT JOHNSON
 3
   MICHAEL A. BITTNER
   J. TRAVIS UNDERWOOD
   WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
   2121 North Pearl Street
   Suite 900
 6
   Dallas, TX 75201
 7
   E. DANIELLE T. WILLIAMS
   WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
 8
   300 South Tyron Street
   16th Floor
   Charlotte, NC 28202
10
11
   MATTHEW R. MCCULLOUGH
   WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
12
   275 Middlefield Road
   Suite 205
   Menlo Park, CA 94025
13
14
   JACK WESLEY HILL
15
   WARD, SMITH & HILL, PLLC
   P.O. Box 1231
16
   1507 Bill Owens Parkway
   Longview, TX 75606
17
18
   COURT REPORTER:
                      Shelly Holmes, CSR, TCRR
19
                       Official Court Reporter
                       United States District Court
                       Eastern District of Texas
20
                       Marshall Division
21
                       100 E. Houston
                       Marshall, Texas 75670
22
                       (903) 923-7464
23
    (Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography, transcript
24
   produced on a CAT system.)
25
```

09:49:06	1	PROCEEDINGS
09:49:06	2	(Venire panel in.)
09:49:08	3	COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.
09:49:11	4	THE COURT: Good morning. Please be seated.
09:49:23	5	Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. It's good to
09:49:37	6	have you with us this morning.
09:49:38	7	My name is Rodney Gilstrap, and I am the Chief
09:49:45	8	United States District Judge for the U.S. District Court
09:49:47	9	for the Eastern District of Texas.
09:49:48	10	I live here in Marshall. I've lived in Marshall
09:49:52	11	since 1981 when I graduated from law school and came here
09:49:56	12	to start practicing law. I've practiced law in and around
09:49:59	13	this part of Texas for 30 years before I was nominated and
09:50:04	14	confirmed to be a U.S. District Judge. And I will confess
09:50:08	15	to you that I was not born in Texas, but I got here as
09:50:12	16	quick as I could.
09:50:13	17	I was born in Pensacola, Florida, and I came to
09:50:16	18	Texas to go to college at Baylor University where I did my
09:50:20	19	undergraduate degree, and then I stayed and went to law
09:50:25	20	school at Baylor School of Law.
09:50:27	21	I'm married. I have two grown children. And my
09:50:29	22	wife owns and operates a retail floral business here in
09:50:32	23	Marshall.
09:50:33	24	Now, I tell you all these things about myself
09:50:35	25	because in a few minutes, I'm going to ask each of you to

9:50:38 1 give me the same kind of information about each of you.
9:50:41 2 And I think you're entitled to know as much about me as I'm
9:50:44 3 about to find out about each of you.

We are about to engage in the selection of a jury in a civil case involving allegations of patent infringement. However, before we go any further, I'd like to briefly review with you how we came to have our civil jury trial system in the United States.

If you go back in ancient history and if you begin with the first five books of the Old Testament, the Pentateuch, you'll see that the ancient Jewish Nation empaneled juries to decide issues of property ownership and property value.

The ancient Greeks began using a jury system about 1500 BC. The Romans, as they did with many things, copied the jury system from the Greeks. And it was the Romans that brought the jury system to what we now know as Great Britain when they conquered that island in the 4th Century AD.

Having brought the jury system to Great Britain in the 4th Century AD, it flourished there for 800 years until the 12th century when a tyrannical king came to the throne of Great Britain known as King John. And King John ended up in a series of multiple disputes with his nobles which led England to the brink of civil war.

09:50:38 09:50:41 09:50:44 09:50:46 4 09:50:50 5 09:50:53 09:50:57 7 09:51:01 09:51:03 09:51:07 10 09:51:13 11

09:51:20 14 09:51:23 15 09:51:29 16 09:51:32 17 09:51:36 18

09:51:15

09:51:18

12

13

19

09:51:40 20 09:51:43 21 09:51:47 22 09:51:55 23

09:51:40

09:51:59 24 09:52:03 25 09:52:06

09:52:11

09:52:14

09:52:18

09:52:22

09:52:23

09:52:27

09:52:30

09:52:34

09:52:40

09:52:43

09:52:48

09:52:50

09:52:55

09:53:00

09:53:07

09:53:10

09:53:14

09:53:17

09:53:20

09:53:24

09:53:27

09:53:30

09:53:34

09:53:38

1

2

3

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Among those disputes was King John's efforts to do away with the right to trial by jury in a civil case.

Those disputes, as I say, led England to the brink of civil war, but that civil war was avoided by an agreement.

A settlement was reached between the king and his nobles, signed at a location known as Runnymede. And the document that settled all those disputes and avoided civil war and restored the right to trial by jury in a civil case in England is known as the Magna Carta. In fact, ladies and gentlemen, 28 of our 50 United States have adopted from the Magna Carta the exact language verbatim guaranteeing the right to trial by jury in a civil case.

So you can see that the right to trial by jury was an important part of life in Great Britain for centuries before those brave souls who traveled across the Atlantic Ocean came to these shores as colonists of Great Britain, and they brought with them the concept of the right to trial by jury in a civil case. And that right to trial by jury in a civil case flourished in British North America for over a hundred years until another tyrannical king came to the throne of Great Britain.

This time his name was King George III. In fact, when Thomas Jefferson sat down to write the Declaration of Independence that specifies clearly and specifically why we should separate from Great Britain and form our own

independent nation, one of the specific points spelled out in the Declaration of Independence was the Crown's efforts to prevent there being the right to trial by jury in civil 3 cases in this country.

> After we won our independence, that right was so important that it was written into our governing document, which you should all know to be the Constitution of the United States. In fact, it's a part of what we call the Bill of Rights, the first 10 amendments to the Constitution.

Those rights were added and ratified in 1791, and among those first two -- first 10 amendments, you find the Seventh Amendment. The Seventh Amendment to the U.S. Constitution guarantees constitutionally to every American citizen the right to submit their civil disputes to a trial by jury, and we've had that right since 1791.

So by being here today, ladies and gentlemen, and presenting yourselves for jury duty, in a very real way, you are all doing important public service to preserve and protect and defend the rights that we enjoy as Americans, including the right to trial by jury in a civil case.

I always tell citizens who appear for jury duty, as you have this morning, that in my personal opinion, jury duty is the second highest form of public service any American can render. In my personal opinion, the highest

09:53:41 1 09:53:46 09:53:50 09:53:53 09:53:55 5 09:54:00 6 7 09:54:04 09:54:08 8 09:54:10 09:54:13 10 09:54:13 11 12 13 14

09:54:19 09:54:24 09:54:27 09:54:31 15 09:54:34

09:54:42 18 09:54:46 19 20 09:54:50 09:54:55 21

17

22

09:54:38

09:55:02 23 09:55:07 24

09:54:57

09:55:10 25 :14 1 form of public service that any American can render to our :19 2 country is to serve in our armed forces.

Now, later this morning, the lawyers are going to address the panel, that's those of you who have appeared for jury duty, and they're going to ask questions, and that's their right to ask questions as a part of securing a fair and impartial jury from among you to hear the evidence in this case.

But as they ask those questions of you later this morning, I want you to understand that they're not trying to be nosy; they're not trying to pry into your personal affairs unduly. They are trying to carry out their obligation to secure for the purposes of this trial a fair and impartial jury to hear the evidence.

I don't know if it will happen this morning during jury selection, it rarely does, but I want to make you aware that if you should specifically be asked a question -- and some of these questions will be to the panel as a whole, some of them will be to specific members of the jury panel, each of you individually, so you can expect questions both ways -- but if during the process you should be asked a question that you consider to be so personal and so private that you're not comfortable answering it in front of the rest of the panel, then you always have the right to simply say, I'd like to discuss

 09:55:14
 1

 09:55:19
 2

 09:55:21
 3

 09:55:26
 4

 09:55:30
 5

 09:55:32
 6

 09:55:35
 7

 09:55:39
 8

 09:55:40
 9

09:55:43 10 09:55:46 11 09:55:49 12 09:55:53 13 09:55:58 14

09:56:01 15 09:56:04 16 09:56:08 17 09:56:11 18 09:56:13 19 20 09:56:17 09:56:19 21 22 09:56:23 09:56:25 23 09:56:28 24

09:56:31

25

9:56:34 1 that with Judge Gilstrap.

And if that's your answer, I'll provide an opportunity for you to answer that question to me outside of the presence of the rest of the members on the panel.

However, ladies and gentlemen, that is a rarity. It doesn't come up often, but I want you to know that at least that possibility is there if it should.

The important thing is, while you're being questioned this morning that your answers are full, complete, and truthful to the questions that are asked. There are no wrong answers to any of the questions you're going to be asked as long as your responses are full, complete, and truthful.

Now, the trial in this case will begin today and will continue through the remainder of this week, and I expect that we will finish and have a verdict sometime on Friday of this week. That's my expectation.

And so I need to ask if there are any persons on the panel that either have a surgical procedure scheduled this week for you or a member of your family that's dependent upon you, or if you have non-refundable international airline tickets to leave the country -- and hopefully a return ticket to come back -- if there's some very serious reason why you could not be here this week if you were selected to serve on the jury, then I need to know

09:56:34 1 09:56:35 2 09:56:38 3 09:56:40 09:56:44 5 09:56:46 7 09:56:49 09:56:51 8 09:56:53 09:56:56 10 09:56:59 11 09:57:03 12 09:57:05 13 09:57:07 14

09:57:12 15 09:57:14 16 09:57:20 17

09:57:22 18 09:57:26 19 09:57:29 20 09:57:32 21 09:57:35 22

09:57:42 24

23

09:57:39

09:57:46 25

```
09:57:49
           about that. If there's anybody that falls in that
         1
           category, please raise their hand.
09:57:51
                    I don't see anybody in the jury box. I don't see
09:57:53
         3
            anybody outside the jury box. I see no hands. Okay.
09:57:59
            Thank you.
09:58:03
         5
09:58:03
                    At this time, I'm going to call for announcements
            in the case of United States Automobile Association --
        7
09:58:07
            excuse me -- United Services Automobile Association versus
09:58:08
         8
            Wells Fargo Bank. This is Civil Case No. 2:18-CV-366.
09:58:14
09:58:20
       10
                    And, counsel, as you give your announcements,
           please identify yourselves, the members of your trial
09:58:22
        11
09:58:24
       12
            teams, and any corporate representatives that you have with
09:58:28
       13
            you. We'll begin first with the Plaintiff. What says the
           Plaintiff?
09:58:32
       14
09:58:33
       15
                    MR. BUNT: Thank you, Your Honor. Good morning,
            ladies and gentlemen. My name is Chris Bunt, and I
09:58:35
       16
            represent the Plaintiff, United Services Automobile
09:58:38
       17
           Association whom we will refer to as USAA.
09:58:42
       18
09:58:43
       19
                    With me today is Mr. Jason Sheasby, Ms. Lisa
09:58:47
       20
            Glasser, Mr. Tony Roles, and our corporate representative,
            Mr. John Brady, who is a vice president at USAA.
09:58:55
        21
        22
                    And, Your Honor, we're ready to proceed.
09:58:58
09:59:00
       23
                    THE COURT: Thank you, counsel.
09:59:01
       24
                    What says the Defendant?
09:59:02 25
                    MR. HILL: Good morning, Your Honor. May it
```

please the Court. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. 1 name is Wesley Hill, and it is my privilege in this case to represent the Defendant, Wells Fargo Bank. And I'd like to 3 introduce you to the other folks here at the table with me.

> Trying the case with me this week will be Mr. Tom Melsheimer, Ms. Danielle Williams, and Mr. Brett Johnson. And our corporate representative, ladies and gentlemen, from Wells Fargo Bank is Mr. Al Hecht. He's a senior vice president with Wells Fargo.

> > And we're also ready to proceed, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, as I've told you, this is a patent case arising under the patent laws of the United States. And what the Plaintiff, USAA, is claiming in this case is that their patents were infringed by the Defendant, Wells Fargo Bank, and the Plaintiff is seeking money damages because of that alleged infringement.

Now, the Defendant, Wells Fargo, denies that it has infringed the patents owned by USAA and Wells Fargo contends that those patents are invalid.

Now, what I've just told you is a very shorthand informal way of describing this case in layman's terms. I know that you've all seen the video prepared by the Federal Judicial Center on patent cases, and having seen that, you know more than most citizens in East Texas do about the

09:59:05 09:59:07 09:59:10 09:59:14 09:59:16 5 09:59:18 7 09:59:22 09:59:24 09:59:31 09:59:32 10 09:59:34 11 09:59:35 12

09:59:38 13 09:59:41 14 09:59:45 15 09:59:48 16 09:59:53 17 09:59:55 18

09:59:58 19 10:00:04 20 21 10:00:07

10:00:14 10:00:18 24

10:00:10

22

23

10:00:21 25 patent process.

As I say, the lawyers on both sides are about to question the panel to gather information to exercise their challenges and complete the process of securing eight jurors who will serve as the jury in this case and will hear the evidence on a fair and an impartial basis.

Again, ladies and gentlemen, there are no wrong answers to any of the questions you'll be asked as long as the responses you give are full, complete, and truthful.

During the jury selection process, if any of the attorneys should ask anybody on the panel or the panel as a whole a question that I don't think is proper, I will certainly stop them. But I want you to understand, ladies and gentlemen, these are very skilled and experienced trial lawyers. They understand the rules of this Court. I don't expect that to happen.

One thing I do want to call your attention to before the lawyers begin their questioning, because I suspect you may be questioned about it by the lawyers, is the burden of proof that will be applied in this case.

In a patent case like this, a jury may be called upon to apply two different burdens of proof. The jury may apply a burden of proof known as the preponderance of the evidence, as well as a second burden of proof known as clear and convincing evidence.

10:00:24 1 10:00:25 2 10:00:28 3 10:00:33 10:00:36 5 10:00:39 10:00:42 7 10:00:45 10:00:48 9 10:00:52 10 10:00:56 11 12 10:00:59 10:01:02 13 10:01:04 14 10:01:08 15 10:01:11 16 10:01:12 17

10:01:12 17
10:01:15 18
10:01:18 19
10:01:21 20

 10:01:28
 22

 10:01:33
 23

10:01:25

21

10:01:37 24

10:01:39 25

10:01:40

10:01:47

10:01:50

10:01:52

10:01:56

10:02:00

10:02:04

10:02:07

10:02:11

10:02:17

10:02:18

10:02:22

10:02:25

10:02:26

10:02:29

10:02:33

10:02:37

10:02:40

10:02:44

10:02:47

10:02:50

10:02:54

10:02:55

10:03:00

10:03:02 25

1

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Now, when you -- when you're responding to any of the lawyers' questions about your ability to apply these burdens of proof, I need to instruct you that when the party -- when a party has the burden of proof on any claim or defense by a preponderance of the evidence -- that's the first burden of proof I mentioned to you -- that means that the jury must be persuaded by the credible or believable evidence that that claim or defense is more probably true than not true. I'll say that again, more probably true than not true.

Sometimes this preponderance of the evidence is talked about as being the greater weight and degree of credible testimony.

Let me see if I can give you an example that I hope will help. I think everyone in the room can see in front of our court reporter a statue of the Lady of Justice. She is blindfolded. She holds the Sword of Justice in her right hand lowered at her side. And at her left, she holds above her the Scales of Justice. And those scales are equally balanced. And that's where the parties start off in this case, equally balanced in the same position.

Over the course of the trial, both sides are going to put on evidence in this case. And you can think of it as putting evidence on one side of the scales for the

Plaintiff and one side of the scales for the Defendant.

And when all the evidence has been presented, the jury is going to be asked to answer certain questions. And if the party has the burden of proof on any question, and you look at those scales and you consider all the evidence that's been put on both sides during the trial, if those scales tip in favor of the party who has the burden of proof, even if they tip ever so slightly, then that party has met the burden of proof of a preponderance of the evidence.

On the other hand, ladies and gentlemen, where a party has that second burden of proof, proving any defense by a clear -- by clear and convincing evidence, it means that the jury must have an abiding conviction that the truth of the party's factual contentions are highly probable. I'll say that again, an abiding conviction that the truth of the party's factual contentions are highly probable. This second standard, this clear and convincing evidence standard is a higher burden of proof than the preponderance of the evidence.

If you think about the example I gave you, the evidence is put on each side of the scales by Plaintiff and Defendant over the course of the trial. Then the jury's asked to consider that in answering certain questions. If a party has the burden of proof by clear and convincing

10:03:04 1
10:03:07 2
10:03:09 3
10:03:14 4
10:03:17 5
10:03:19 6
10:03:23 7
10:03:27 8
10:03:31 9
10:03:33 10

10:03:38 11 10:03:40 12 10:03:46 13 10:03:48 14 10:03:52 15 10:03:58 16 10:04:01 17 10:04:04 18 10:04:07 19

10:04:15 21 10:04:18 22 10:04:20 23

20

10:04:12

10:04:22 24

10:04:26 25

evidence, then those scales must tip in that party's favor, and they must definitely tip in that party's favor. It is not adequate if they tip ever so slightly.

Clear and convincing evidence requires more and is a higher burden of proof than the preponderance of the evidence.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, there's a third burden of proof that has absolutely no application in this case, but I'm confident every one of you has heard about it because you've seen it on television and you've seen it in the movies, and that's beyond a reasonable doubt. That burden of proof, beyond a reasonable doubt, is the burden of proof applied in a criminal case, and it has absolutely no application whatsoever in a civil case such as this.

You should not -- you should not confuse clear and convincing evidence with beyond a reasonable doubt. It's not as high as beyond a reasonable doubt, but it is a higher standard than the preponderance of the evidence.

I give you these instructions in case the lawyers ask you about your ability to apply those two burdens of proof fairly and impartially to the evidence that will be presented if you're selected to serve on this jury.

Now, before the lawyers address you, I'm going to let each of you at this time give me the same information about each of yourselves that I gave you about myself when

10:04:29 1
10:04:33 2
10:04:37 3
10:04:43 4
10:04:46 5
10:04:48 6
10:04:48 7

10:04:52 8
10:04:54 9
10:04:57 10
10:05:00 11
10:05:05 12
10:05:08 13

10:05:12 14 10:05:17 15 10:05:20 16 10:05:22 17 10:05:26 18

10:05:31 19 10:05:33 20 10:05:37 21 10:05:40 22

10:05:42 23 10:05:48 24 10:05:52 25 we started this morning. Each of you have laminated copies of nine questions, and I think they're also shown on the screen -- or they will be. They're readily available to you.

This is how we're going to do this, ladies and gentlemen. We're going to start with Panel Member No. 1, and the Court Security Officer is going to bring a handheld microphone to Panel Member No. 1. And at that point, I'm go to ask that member of the panel to stand and answer those nine questions. And, if you will, make sure that you hold the handheld microphone close enough so that you can be heard.

This is a big room. There are a lot of bodies in here. And it takes a lot of sound so that everybody can hear, so make sure that you speak up.

Also, please direct your answers toward the lawyers at the tables because they're the ones that need to know the answers to these questions from each of you.

Then when we're finished with Panel Member No. 1, he'll hand the microphone to Panel Member No. 2. She'll do the same thing. And Panel Member No. 3 is next. And we'll go through all the members of the panel one at a time.

Also, ladies and gentlemen, I'd like to tell you that during the process where you're actually being asked questions by the lawyers, if you're asked a specific

10:05:54 10:05:59 10:06:02 10:06:07 10:06:07 5 10:06:09 7 10:06:12 10:06:16 10:06:18 10:06:23 10 10:06:26 11 12 10:06:29 10:06:30 13

10:06:33 14 10:06:37 15

10:06:39 16 10:06:41 17 10:06:44 18

10:06:47

10:06:50 20 10:06:53 21 10:06:56 22

19

23

10:07:04 24

10:06:58

10:07:07 25

question that calls for you to give a specific response, 10:07:10 1 10:07:14 then you should wait until the handheld microphone is brought to you by the Court Security Officer, stand, and 10:07:16 give your answer to the lawyer that's asked the question. 10:07:19 We'll do it the same way for questions asked 10:07:24 5 10:07:27 during the examination by the lawyers as we will during this background information section when you answer those 7 10:07:30 10:07:33 nine questions for us. 10:07:34 So with that, we'll begin with Panel Member No. 1, and we'll ask our Court Security Officer, Mr. Johnston, to 10:07:40 10 take the microphone to Panel Member No. 1. 10:07:42 11 12 JUROR BOUZEK: Good morning. My name is Charles 10:07:45 Bouzek. I live in Diana, Texas. I have two grown sons. 10:07:53 13 My place of employment is Sabine Mining company -- or 10:07:58 14 10:08:01 15 actually coal mining company, obviously. I'm operation supervisor with them. I've been with them for 36 years. 10:08:05 16 10:08:09 17 My educational background is I am a high school graduate. I have an A and P license, which is an Airframe 10:08:13 18 and Powerplant license which I acquired through St. Louis 10:08:18 19 10:08:24 20 University. It's also where I'm from. 21 My spouse's name is Kathleen Kay. She's a 10:08:26 10:08:30 22 seamstress, and she's done that work for many years, and 10:08:33 23 she works out of our home. 10:08:36 24 And I -- prior jury services, I've sat on one

criminal case, and that's the extent of it.

10:08:41 25

```
THE COURT: Where was that criminal case, sir, and
10:08:46
         1
         2 | how long ago was it?
10:08:48
                    JUROR BOUZEK: It's approximately about 15 years
10:08:49
         3
10:08:51
        4 ago; Upshur County.
                    THE COURT: Thank you. If you'll hand the mic to
10:08:52
         5
10:08:55
        6 Ms. Jones, Panel Member No. 2.
        7
                    JUROR JONES: Hello. Cheryl Jones. I live in
10:08:56
           Gilmer, Diana school district.
10:09:00
        8
10:09:03
                    THE COURT: Ms. Jones, hold the microphone a
           little closer.
10:09:05 10
10:09:06 11
                    JUROR JONES: I'm sorry.
10:09:06 12
                    THE COURT: Thank you.
                    JUROR JONES: Cheryl Jones, Gilmer, Texas. I have
10:09:08 13
           one child. I'm employed at Christus DeHaven Eye Center.
10:09:09
       14
10:09:15
       15
            I've been there about 17 years. My education is high
           school and some college certifications.
10:09:18 16
       17
                    Spouse is Danny Jones. He works for East Texas
10:09:21
           Machine Works. He's been there about 25 years.
10:09:25
       18
                    And my prior would be criminal case, and I'm not
10:09:28 19
10:09:33 20
           sure how long ago that was.
10:09:35 21
                    THE COURT: It's been quite a few years?
10:09:37 22
                    JUROR JONES: It has.
10:09:38 23
                    THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am.
10:09:39 24
                    Next is No. 3, Ms. Harris.
                    JUROR GAYLE HARRIS: Good morning. My name is
10:09:42 25
```

```
Gayla Harris. And I live in Pittsburg. I have three grown
10:09:44
         1
            sons. I'm semi-retired. I worked at Lakeside Baptist
10:09:46
            Church in Canton, Texas, for 10 years. I have an Associate
10:09:54
         3
            of Arts degree in business.
10:09:58
                    My spouse's name is Kyle Harris. And he is a
10:10:00
         5
10:10:03
            captain for the Mesquite Fire Department in Mesquite,
            Texas. And he's been there close to 20 years.
        7
10:10:06
                    And I have no prior jury service.
10:10:09
         8
10:10:10
                    THE COURT: All right. Thank you, ma'am.
         9
                    Next is Panel Member No. 4.
10:10:11
        10
10:10:14
        11
                    JUROR JOHNS: My name is Travis Johns. I live in
           Hughes Springs, Texas. I have two children. One is a
10:10:17
        12
10:10:21
        13
            senior in high school, one is a sophomore. I work for
            Christus Good Shepherd as a registered nurse. I also work
10:10:24
        14
            at UT Health in their Trauma Unit. Christus, I work in the
10:10:27
        15
            surgical oncology. A little over a year on both. I have
10:10:34
       16
            my Associate's degree in nursing. I'm working on my
10:10:36
       17
            Bachelor's right now.
10:10:38
       18
                    My wife's name is Melissa Jones. She's a dental
10:10:40
       19
       20
10:10:44
           hygienist for East Texas Children's Dentistry in
       21
            Mt. Pleasant. She's worked there a little over 10 years.
10:10:45
10:10:47
       22
                    And I served on one jury case, and that was a
10:10:49
       23
           criminal.
10:10:50 24
                    THE COURT: All right. Thank you, sir.
10:10:55 25
                   No. 5 is next, Ms. Fisher.
```

```
JUROR FISHER: My name is Pamela Fisher. I have
10:10:55
         1
10:10:58
           two grown children. I also have a stepdaughter who is
         2
            grown. I'm currently not employed, thinking of -- retiring
10:11:01
            is my status is what it should be. I was a nurse, and I've
10:11:06
            been a nurse since '96. I went to high school here in
10:11:11
10:11:16
            Marshall. I graduated from Kilgore Junior College.
                    My spouse is Richard Fisher. He's also retired.
        7
10:11:21
           And he's retired from a mining company in Tatum. He worked
10:11:25
10:11:32
            there for 35 years.
                    And I have had prior jury service. One was a
10:11:34
        10
10:11:38
        11
            mental incompetency case, and I've also been here in this
        12
            court. And I don't know what kind of case you would call
10:11:44
            it, but...
10:11:47
        13
                    THE COURT: How long ago was that that you
10:11:49
       14
10:11:50
       15
           appeared in this court and served on a jury?
       16
                    JUROR FISHER: I don't know, six or seven years
10:11:53
10:11:55
       17
            ago.
                    THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, ma'am.
10:11:55
       18
                    All right. Next is Mr. Meade, No. 6.
10:11:59
       19
10:12:02
       20
                    JUROR MEADE: Name is Jeffery Meade. I live in
            Naples, Texas. I have one eight-year-old son. Currently
10:12:04
        21
10:12:09
       22
            employed with Sandlin Chevrolet in Mt. Pleasant, body shop
10:12:16
       23
            estimator. Been there right at 10 years. I have an
10:12:20
       24
           Associate's degree in accounting from NTCC.
10:12:23 25
                  My wife is Holly Meade. She's retired --
```

```
medically retired Air Force and currently employed with Mt.
10:12:27
         1
            Pleasant ISD as a computer technician. Been there -- she's
10:12:32
         2
            fixing to be there 10 years, as well.
10:12:35
         3
                     One criminal drug case in Titus County.
10:12:36
         4
                     THE COURT: How long ago was that, sir?
10:12:39
         5
10:12:42
                     JUROR MEADE: Seven, eight years.
         6
         7
                     THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much.
10:12:43
                     Next is No. 7.
10:12:46
         8
                     JUROR NILSSON: Good morning. My name is Aaron
10:12:48
            Nilsson. I'm from Daingerfield, Texas. I have three
10:12:50
       10
            children, an 11-year-old daughter, 12-year-old daughter,
10:12:53
        11
            15-year-old son. I work at WOI Petroleum, where my mother
10:12:57
        12
            and I started the company in '98 and sold it in 2016, so I
10:13:01
        13
10:13:07
       14
            work for the -- the new owner. I have a high school
10:13:09
       15
            education.
                     My wife's name is Meredith Nilsson. She owns and
10:13:10
       16
            operates a salon in downtown Daingerfield. And she bought
10:13:15
       17
            that from the previous owner in '13.
10:13:15
       18
10:13:18
       19
                     And I have no prior service as far as jury is
       20
10:13:20
            concerned.
10:13:21
        21
                     THE COURT: Thank you, sir.
        22
                     And we'll ask the Court Security Officer to carry
10:13:21
10:13:24
       23
            the microphone around to Panel Member No. 8, Ms. McDonald.
10:13:29
       24
                     JUROR MCDONALD: My name is Karen McDonald.
            live in Hallsville, Texas. I have no children. I'm
10:13:33 25
```

```
retired. I used to work at Blue Cross Blue Shield as a
10:13:36
        1
10:13:39
           claims examiner. I worked there for 12 years. High school
           graduation -- graduate.
10:13:43
         3
                    My spouse's name is John McDonald. He is retired
10:13:44
            from LeTourneau. He used to be an application engineer.
10:13:47
10:13:52
           He worked there for about 12 years. And I've served on one
        7
           jury here in district -- in this courthouse back in '84,
10:13:55
            '85.
10:14:00
         8
10:14:01
                    THE COURT: That's fine. That long ago, it
           doesn't matter. If you'll pass the microphone to No. 9.
10:14:04
       10
10:14:10
       11
                    JUROR MANNING: Hi. My name is Rose Manning. I
            live in Elysian Field, Texas, off of 31. I have no kids.
10:14:13
       12
10:14:20
       13
            I work at Genpak Corp. -- cups -- plastic plates and cups.
            That's what I work with. I've been there for 10 years. I
10:14:28
       14
10:14:31
       15
           had a high school education.
                    My spouse name, Willie Manning. He retired from
10:14:36
       16
            Tyson Foods in Carthage.
10:14:39
       17
                    I have no other --
10:14:43
       18
                    THE COURT: No jury service, ma'am?
10:14:46 19
10:14:47
       20
                    JUROR MANNING: No.
10:14:48
       21
                    THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
10:14:49
       22
                    Next is No. 10, Ms. Walker.
10:14:52
       23
                    JUROR WALKER: My name is Laney Walker. I live in
10:14:55 24
           Daingerfield, Texas. I have one son, and currently
10:14:58 25
           pregnant with our second child. I work at Healthcare
```

```
Express. It's an urgent care clinic. I'm a registered
10:15:01
        1
10:15:05
           nurse. I've worked there for about five years. I have two
           Associate's degrees from NTCC in Mt. Pleasant.
10:15:09
                    My husband's name is Cameron Walker. He currently
10:15:13
            works for the City of Marshall as a firefighter paramedic.
10:15:13
10:15:18
            Been there for about four years. And I have no prior jury
        7
            services.
10:15:19
                    THE COURT: All right. Thank you, ma'am.
10:15:20
         8
10:15:21
                    Next is No. 11, Mr. Rankin.
        9
                    JUROR RANKIN: My name is -- excuse me -- my name
10:15:24
       10
10:15:28
       11
            is Josh Rankin. I have six kids. I'm divorced. I have
            three with my first wife and three with my second wife. My
10:15:34
        12
            oldest is 18, and I have twin nine-month-olds at home. So
10:15:36
       13
            anyways, I'm -- I'm from Hallsville. I work at Hallsville
10:15:40
       14
       15
            at the high school. I coach and teach. I've been there
10:15:45
            for three years. I got my Master's and Bachelor's at
10:15:48
       16
            Southern Arkansas University.
10:15:54
       17
                    My wife's name is Christi, and she's -- currently
10:15:55
       18
10:15:58
       19
            is staying at home, but she has worked as a doctor's
            assistant.
10:16:00
       20
10:16:04
       21
                    And this is my -- I have no prior service.
                    THE COURT: All right, sir. Thank you.
10:16:08
       22
10:16:09 23
                   No. 12 is next.
10:16:10 24
                    JUROR KASSIDY HARRIS: My name is Kassidy Harris.
10:16:15 25 | I live in Pittsburg, Texas. I don't have any kids. I'm a
```

```
missions and discipleship pastor at First Baptist Church in
10:16:20
        1
10:16:24
            Pittsburg. I've worked there about six-and-a-half years.
            I have a high school education, a Bachelor's degree, and
10:16:24
         3
10:16:29
            Master's degree.
                    My spouse's name is Codi CheyAnne Harris. She's a
10:16:30
         5
10:16:34
            labor and delivery nurse at Titus Regional, and she's
            worked there about five years. And I have never served on
10:16:38
        7
10:16:41
            a jury.
        8
10:16:41
                    THE COURT: Thank you.
                    No. 13 is next, Mr. Richardson.
10:16:41
        10
10:16:46
       11
                    JUROR RICHARDSON: Good morning, David Richardson.
            I live here in Marshall. I have two grown children and
10:16:47
       12
10:16:51
        13
            three step grown children. I don't like the word "step."
            They're my children. I worked at Eastman Chemical in
10:16:55
       14
            Longview for 40 years. And I -- I have a high school
10:17:00
       15
            education.
10:17:04
       16
                    My wife is Kerry Richardson. She's a registered
10:17:04
       17
           nurse here at Christus Good Shepherd for 16 years.
10:17:09
       18
10:17:11 19
                    And I have served on a criminal case, probably six
10:17:13 20
           to eight years ago.
       21
10:17:14
                    THE COURT: Where was that, sir?
10:17:15 22
                    JUROR RICHARDSON: It was here in Harrison County.
10:17:17 23
                    THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much.
10:17:18 24
                    Ms. Pate is next, No. 14.
                    JUROR PATE: Lara Pate. I'm from Naples and I
10:17:21 25
```

```
have three kids. I work at Pewitt CISD. I've been there
10:17:24
         1
            for three years. Well, no, that's my second year back
10:17:29
            there, sorry.
10:17:33
         3
                     THE COURT: What do you do at Pewitt?
10:17:34
         4
                     JUROR PATE: I teach second grade.
10:17:36
         5
                    THE COURT: Thank you.
10:17:38
         6
         7
                     JUROR PATE: I have a Master's in special
10:17:40
            education.
10:17:42
         8
                     My husband is Adam Pate, and he's a rural mail
10:17:43
         9
            carrier for Omaha for about three years.
10:17:49
        10
        11
                    And I have never served on a jury.
10:17:52
10:17:54
       12
                     THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
10:17:55
       13
                    And we'll ask the Court Security Officer to carry
            the mic around to Panel Member No. 15, Ms. Shepard.
10:17:58
       14
10:18:01
       15
                     JUROR SHEPARD: My name is Christie Shepard.
            live here in Marshall. I have two teenage children.
10:18:04
       16
            work for Texas Health and Human Services Commission as a
10:18:07
        17
        18
            case manager. I have worked there for 25 years. I have a
10:18:11
10:18:15
        19
            Bachelor of Science degree from East Texas Baptist
10:18:18
        20
            University here in Marshall.
                     My spouse is Jason Shepard. He is a draftsman for
10:18:19
        21
        22
            MTX Surveying here in Marshall, recently started there.
10:18:24
10:18:29
       23
            They merged with his previous employer ArkLaTex Surveying.
10:18:36
       24
                     I served on a criminal case probably seven or
10:18:40 25
            eight years ago here in Harrison County.
```

```
THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am. No. 16 is next.
10:18:40
         1
10:18:43
                    JUROR HILGENFELD: Hi I'm Karen Hilgenfeld. I
         2
            live in Omaha. I work for Cable Interiors, which is a --
10:18:46
            and I worked for them about 20 years. I do the finances.
10:18:54
            We do data and voice cabling, and I'm not sure if this is
10:18:58
10:19:03
            appropriate, I need to say that 90 percent of our income
        7
            and our major customer is Wells Fargo.
10:19:07
                    THE COURT: That will come out.
10:19:15
         8
10:19:16
                    JUROR HILGENFELD: So I've worked there about 20
10:19:22
       10 years.
10:19:22
       11
                    THE COURT: What about education?
       12
                    JUROR HILGENFELD: I am a high school dip -- I
10:19:24
           have my high school diploma. I've had some accounting in
10:19:28
       13
           college.
10:19:31
       14
                    My spouse is Walter Hilgenfeld. He lives in Omaha
10:19:32
       15
            also. And he is a retired AT&T employee for about the last
10:19:37
       16
            seven years.
10:19:44
       17
                    And I was on a criminal case in Dallas about 20
10:19:44
       18
10:19:53
       19
           years ago.
10:19:53 20
                    THE COURT: All right. Thank you, ma'am.
                    No. 17 is next, Ms. Brown.
10:19:55 21
10:19:57
       22
                    JUROR TRACEY BROWN: My name is Tracey Brown, and
10:19:59
       23
            I am from Longview, Texas. I have two children. I am the
10:20:03
       24
            department supervisor of the Home Depot. I have worked
10:20:08 25
           there for almost 17 years. I have some college.
```

```
10:20:12
         1
                     I have no spouse.
10:20:13
                    And I've never had any prior jury service.
         2
10:20:17
                    THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, ma'am. No.
         3
                     18, Mr. Allbritton.
10:20:20
         4
                    JUROR ALLBRITTON: Henry Allbritton. I live in
10:20:22
         5
            Gilmer, Texas. I have two children. I own Allbritton
10:20:24
        7
            Timber in Gilmer for the last 20 years. I have a 12th
10:20:28
10:20:34
            grade education.
         8
10:20:35
                    I have no spouse.
                    And I've never served on a jury before.
10:20:37
        10
10:20:38
       11
                    THE COURT: All right. Sir. Thank you.
                    Next will be Panel Member No. 19, Mr. Pickens.
10:20:40
       12
10:20:46
       13
                    JUROR PICKENS: My name is Paul Pickens. I have
10:20:49
            four children total. Place of employment currently is
       14
            Steel Line Rail Service where we do railcar inspections.
10:20:54
       15
            I've been there with them about nine months now. I have a
10:20:58
       16
            high school education.
10:21:02
       17
                    My spouse's name is Amy Pickens. She works at
10:21:03
       18
            Trinity Rail in Longview as a recruiter. She's been there
10:21:06
       19
        20
10:21:11
            about five years now.
10:21:14
       21
                    And I have no prior jury service.
10:21:15
       22
                    THE COURT: Thank you, sir.
10:21:18
       23
                    Next is No. 20, Mr. Staley.
10:21:22 24
                    JUROR STALEY: Hi, my name is Mervin Staley.
           live in Bloomburg, Texas. I have two children and a
10:21:26 25
```

stepchild. They're all grown. I've worked at Mid South 10:21:27 1 Distributing for 19 years in Texarkana. I have a high 10:21:31 school diploma. 10:21:35 3 My wife is a RN. Her name is Lisa Staley. She 10:21:36 works from home for an insurance company, and it just left 10:21:43 10:21:43 my mind what the name of the insurance company is but... 7 And I have no prior jury service. 10:21:45 10:21:48 8 THE COURT: All right, sir. 10:21:49 No. 21 is next. 9 JUROR MAWER: Nathan Mawer. I live in Hallsville. 10:21:50 10 10:21:55 11 I have three kids. I work for Weatherford International. 12 10:21:59 I'm the East Texas/North Louisiana operation's manager, I 10:22:03 13 also have a small home building company. I've been at Weatherford almost eight years. I've got a Bachelor's 10:22:07 14 10:22:12 15 degree in business management, minor in construction science. 10:22:15 16 17 My wife's name is Caitlin Mawer. She's a 10:22:15 10:22:19 18 stay-at-home mom. And I have no prior jury service. 10:22:22 19 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 10:22:23 20 No. 22 is next, Mr. Neeley. 21 10:22:26 JUROR NEELEY: Yes, my name is Chad Neeley. I'm 10:22:29 22 from Pittsburg, Texas. I have one daughter that's 17 10:22:34 23 months old. I work for Pittsburg ISD as an ag science 10:22:40 24 teacher. I've been there for roughly going on four years now. My degree is agriculture business from Texas A&M 10:22:43 25

```
10:22:47
        1
           University at Commerce.
10:22:49
                    My spouse's name is Lindsey Neeley. She's a
         2
            teacher, as well. She's been there teaching for 11 years
10:22:52
         3
10:22:56
           now.
                    And I went through a criminal jury selection, but
10:23:00
         5
10:23:04
            the case didn't go to trial.
        6
        7
                    THE COURT: All right, sir. Thank you.
10:23:07
                    No. 23 is next, Ms. Mize.
10:23:09
         8
                    JUROR MIZE: I'm Atrelle Mize. I live in
10:23:12
         9
            Longview. I have five children. They're all grown.
10:23:19
       10
            currently work for a home health agency in Henderson, but I
        11
10:23:21
            retired from Good Shepherd in Longview after 44 years. I
10:23:26
       12
            graduated from Methodist School of Nursing in Dallas.
10:23:30
       13
                    And I'm a widow.
10:23:34
       14
       15
10:23:36
                    And I have no prior jury service.
                    THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am.
10:23:38
       16
                    We'll pass that microphone to Panel Member No. 24,
10:23:39
       17
10:23:48
       18
           Mr. Terry.
                     JUROR TERRY: My name is Cooper Terry. I have a
10:23:49
       19
       20
10:23:52
            Gilmer address, but all the activities that we do are in
            Longview; work, school, and all that. I have three boys;
10:23:54
       21
10:23:56
       22
            20, 18, and 14. I work at a company called Fastenal. I've
10:24:00
       23
           been there for 27 years. I'm a district manager. And
10:24:04
       24
            I've -- I've done that for 17. I graduated from SFA in
10:24:11 25
            '91. I have a BBA in finance.
```

My wife is Debbie Terry. She's in education. 10:24:11 1 10:24:14 works at the central office at Longview ISD -- or, excuse 2 me, Pine Tree ISD -- that was a bad thing -- Pine Tree ISD, 10:24:18 3 and she's been there for about 26 years. 10:24:22 And I've served on a traffic court one time back 10:24:25 5 10:24:27 in Longview about 15 years ago. 6 7 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. If you'll pass 10:24:29 the microphone to No. 25. 10:24:31 8 10:24:33 JUROR STOBAUGH: Good morning. My name is Linda Sue Stobaugh. I live on the outskirts of Marshall. I have 10:24:35 10 10:24:35 11 one grown daughter, three grandchildren, two grown stepchildren with four grandchildren. I have retired from 10:24:43 12 the medical field. I worked at East Texas Baptist -- East 10:24:48 13 Texas Border Health Clinic. We opened the doors in 2004. 10:24:52 14 10:24:56 15 I am now working for myself. I'm a Mary Kay beauty consultant, independent. 10:25:01 16 17 My education, I graduated from Marshall High 10:25:03 School. I went to the Oscar B Jones nursing school here in 10:25:06 18 Marshall. Also, took accounting principle I and II at 10:25:11 19 20 10:25:18 Harris County Community College in Houston. 21 My spouse's name is Jerry W. Stobaugh, Sr. 10:25:20 10:25:26 22 worked for the Union Pacific for 38 years before he 10:25:29 23 retired, and then it became Union Pacific. 10:25:32 24 And I have never served. 10:25:33 25 THE COURT: All right.

```
10:25:37
         1
                    JUROR STOBAUGH: Thank you.
10:25:38
                    THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am. Next is No. 26,
         2
           Ms. Black.
10:25:40
        3
10:25:40
                    JUROR BLACK: My name is Lorie Black. I live here
            in Marshall, Texas. I have two grown children. I am a real
10:25:42
            estate agent for Century 21, and I've been there for about
10:25:45
            a year -- four years, I'm sorry. I have some college with
10:25:49
        7
            some real estate certification.
10:25:52
         8
                    My spouse's name is Kenny Black. He works for
10:25:54
            LATX, which is an oil and gas operation's company. He is
10:25:58
        10
10:26:01
            the general manager there, and he's been there for about a
        11
10:26:04
       12
            year.
10:26:05
       13
                    And I have no prior jury service.
                    THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am.
10:26:06
       14
10:26:07
       15
                    No. 27, Ms. Callaway.
                    JUROR CALLAWAY: My name is Kim Callaway. I live
10:26:10
       16
            in Queen City, and I have two grown children. I work at
10:26:13
       17
            Queen City ISD as a second grade teacher. I've been there
10:26:18
       18
10:26:21
        19
            for 24 years. I have a Bachelor's degree from Texas A&M in
       20
10:26:27
            Texarkana.
10:26:27
       21
                    I have no spouse.
10:26:29
       22
                    And I have no prior jury service.
10:26:33 23
                    THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
10:26:35 24
                    And No. 28, Ms. Brown.
10:26:37 25
                    JUROR ALANA BROWN: My name is Alana Brown.
                                                                   Ι
```

10:26:40	1	live in Diana. I have two 19-year-old sons who are working
10:26:45	2	on being grown. I work for Pace Opportunity Centers in
10:26:48	3	Longview as a case coordinator. I've worked there for
10:26:51	4	about two months. I have a Bachelor's degree in business
10:26:54	5	and management from NC State.
10:26:57	6	My spouse's name is Jim Brown. He works for
10:27:00	7	SWEPCO AEP as a substation supervisor. He's worked for AEP
10:27:06	8	for over 25 years.
10:27:07	9	I served on a criminal case, I believe it was, it
10:27:11	10	was about 2005 in Ohio.
10:27:13	11	THE COURT: All right. Thank you, ma'am.
10:27:14	12	Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.
10:27:19	13	Now, I need to tell you a couple more things
10:27:21	14	before I turn the questioning over to the lawyers.
10:27:24	15	The jurors that are actually selected to serve in
10:27:27	16	this case will serve in the role as the judges of the
10:27:31	17	facts. And the jurors selected will make the sole
10:27:34	18	determination about what the facts are in this case.
10:27:37	19	Now, my job as the Judge is to rule on questions
10:27:41	20	of law, evidence, procedure, to maintain the decorum of the
10:27:46	21	courtroom, and to oversee an efficient flow of the trial
10:27:48	22	and the evidence.
10:27:49	23	Also, I want to say a couple things to you about
10:27:52	24	our judicial system that hopefully will put things in a
10:27:56	25	proper perspective for each of you.

10:27:57

10:28:02

10:28:06

10:28:08

10:28:10

10:28:14

10:28:19

10:28:22

10:28:26

10:28:27

10:28:31

10:28:34

10:28:37

10:28:41

10:28:46

10:28:48

10:28:51

10:28:56

10:29:00

10:29:03

10:29:09

10:29:12

10:29:15

10:29:19

10:29:22

1

3

5

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In every jury trial, besides the actual parties themselves, there are always three participants, the jury, the judge, and the lawyers.

With regard to the lawyers, I think it's important for each of you to understand that our American judicial system is an adversary system, which simply means that during a trial, each of the parties will seek to present their respective cases to the juries -- to the jury in the very best light possible.

Now, it's no surprise to any of you that lawyers are sometimes criticized in the public and in the media, but the Court's observed that at least some of that criticism is a result of a basic misunderstanding about our adversary system in which the lawyers act as advocates for the competing parties.

And as an advocate, a lawyer is ethically and legally obligated to zealously assert his or her client's position under the rules of our adversary system. And by presenting the best case possible on behalf of their clients, the lawyers hopefully will enable the jury to better weigh the relevant evidence, to determine the truth, and to arrive at a just verdict based on that evidence.

Now, this system of justice, this adversary system, has served our nation well for over 200 years, and America's lawyers have been and will continue to be an

indispensable part of the process.

So as we go forward, even though it's possible over the course of the trial you may see me frown or even growl at the lawyers from time to time, it's simply because I'm trying to make sure that their advocacy doesn't get outside the boundaries of our adversary system. But you should keep in mind, they are doing their jobs, and I think it's important for all of you to be aware of that as we go forward.

Also, ladies and gentlemen, over the course of the trial, I'm going to do my very best to make sure that none of you that are on the jury have any idea about what I think about the evidence in this case, because determining what the facts are based on that evidence is the job of the jury over the course of this trial. It is not my job.

And those of you that are selected on the jury should not take any expressions that you see or think you see or any comments that you hear or think you hear from me as being something to consider as a factor in making the ultimate decision about what the facts are in this case.

Now, at this time, the lawyers will have an opportunity to make their presentations and question the members of the jury panel.

We'll begin with the Plaintiff. Mr. Bunt, you may address the panel on behalf of the Plaintiff.

10:29:25 1 10:29:29 2 10:29:31 3 10:29:36 10:29:38 5 10:29:42 10:29:45 7 10:29:49 8 10:29:52 9 10:29:52 10 10:29:54 11 12 10:29:58 10:30:02 13 10:30:07 14 15 10:30:11 10:30:14 16 10:30:16 17 10:30:21 18 10:30:24 19 10:30:28 20 10:30:31 21 10:30:35 22 10:30:38 23

10:30:39

10:30:43 25

24

10:30:44	1	MR. BUNT: Thank you, Your Honor.
10:30:47	2	THE COURT: And you'd like a warning at five
10:30:49	3	minutes, correct?
10:30:50	4	MR. BUNT: Yes, Your Honor. When I have five
10:30:51	5	minutes left. I appreciate it.
10:30:53	6	THE COURT: All right. You may proceed.
10:30:54	7	MR. BUNT: Thank you, Your Honor.
10:30:54	8	Good morning, again, ladies and gentlemen. As I
10:30:57	9	mentioned to you, my name is Chris Bunt. It's my pleasure
10:31:00	10	to be here today representing the Plaintiff, USAA, in this
10:31:06	11	case.
10:31:06	12	You've graciously given us a lot of information
10:31:11	13	about yourselves. We really appreciate that. We
10:31:12	14	appreciate the jury questionnaire forms you've turned in.
10:31:12	15	I'll just briefly give you the same information about me.
10:31:15	16	I grew up in Hallsville. I graduated from high
10:31:18	17	school there. My wife, Celia, also graduated from high
10:31:21	18	school there. We've been living in Tyler for the last 26
10:31:25	19	years.
10:31:27	20	I have a law practice over there, and Celia works
10:31:30	21	as the office manager at our firm. We have two kids. My
10:31:35	22	daughter is 17, and my son is 14.
10:31:38	23	And I have been called on a number of occasions
10:31:41	24	for jury service but have never actually been on a jury
10:31:44	25	panel.

So you're going to hear a lot more about this case as -- as the week progresses. But I want to give you just a very brief overview.

So this case involves two United States patents that are owned by my client, USAA. And these patents relate to depositing checks using your smartphone or mobile device.

So before this invention, if you wanted to deposit a check, you'd go to the bank teller or to the ATM or you might have one of these very expensive commercial check scanners.

USAA invented the use of consumer devices, like smartphones, enabling them to take high quality check images so that the check could be deposited remotely and so that fraud detection could be performed in a real-time during the process.

So that's the case in a nutshell. And we allege that Wells Fargo is using our patented technology in their own product. In patent cases, this sort of trespassing on property is called infringement.

Now, Wells Fargo denies that it is infringing or trespassing on our property. And, indeed, Wells Fargo also claims even if it is infringing, the patents are invalid, that is, that they should not have been issued by the Patent Office.

 10:31:45
 1

 10:31:49
 2

 10:31:53
 3

 10:31:54
 4

 10:31:59
 5

 10:32:05
 6

 10:32:09
 7

10:32:14 9
10:32:18 10
10:32:21 11

8

12

10:32:09

10:32:22

10:32:29 13 10:32:33 14 10:32:37 15 10:32:43 16

10:32:43 17 10:32:46 18 10:32:50 19 10:32:54 20

10:32:58 21 10:33:01 22 10:33:05 23

10:33:12 25

24

10:33:09

And then, finally, Wells Fargo claims even if it's infringing, even if the patents are valid, they're really not worth that much money.

So as His Honor told you, the purpose of voir dire is to give us a chance to talk with you directly to see if this is the right case for you, to see if you're starting out with any life experiences, any likes or dislikes that might make it difficult for you to sit on this jury.

So let me start with that. In my experience, I've found that, generally speaking, most people fall within two groups when it comes to their attitudes about patents.

The first group, people are -- are people who think that patents are a good thing, that they encourage innovation, that innovation is a good thing to make advances in products, that without patent protection, a lot of research and development would not take place. That's Group No. 1, pro patent.

And then Group No. 2 are folks who believe that patents should not be protected by law, that patents are maybe an archaic system, that patents don't really make sense, and it doesn't make sense to give a 20-year monopoly when -- on -- on a patent when technology is changing so rapidly these days; the thought being here with this group, just because patents were a good idea when the Constitution was being framed doesn't mean that they're still a good

10:33:12 1 10:33:16 10:33:20 10:33:22 10:33:27 5 10:33:31 10:33:34 7 10:33:39 10:33:41 10:33:43 10 10:33:51 11 10:33:54 12 10:33:57 13

10:34:02 14 10:34:04 15

10:34:15 17

16

18

10:34:09

10:34:16

10:34:20 19 20 10:34:24 10:34:27 21 10:34:31 22 23

10:34:41 24 10:34:45 25

10:34:37

```
10:34:49
         1
            idea now.
                     Let me start on the first row -- actually let me
10:34:49
         2
            just start with you, Mr. Bouzek.
10:34:52
         3
10:34:54
         4
                     JUROR BOUZEK: Bouzek.
10:34:55
         5
                     MR. BUNT: Bouzek.
                     JUROR BOUZEK: Bouzek.
10:34:57
         6
        7
                     MR. BUNT: Bouzek. Mr. Bouzek.
10:34:57
10:34:59
                     JUROR BOUZEK: It's Bouzek.
         8
                     MR. BUNT: Bouzek.
10:35:00
         9
10:35:02
       10
                     JUROR BOUZEK: Correct.
                     MR. BUNT: Okay. Thank you, sir.
10:35:03
       11
                     Which group do you think you'd fall in? Do you
10:35:05
       12
10:35:08
       13
            think you'd be more in Group 1, pro -- pro patent, or do
            you think you'd fall more in the second category of not
10:35:13
       14
10:35:16
            thinking they're such a hot idea?
       15
                     JUROR BOUZEK: I would consider myself mainly in
10:35:18
       16
            the first group.
10:35:19
       17
       18
                     MR. BUNT: All right.
10:35:20
                     And, Ms. Jones, right next to you, how do you feel
10:35:21
       19
10:35:24
       20
            about that?
10:35:25
       21
                     JUROR JONES: I would say pro -- pro patent.
       22
                     MR. BUNT: Okay. Is there anybody here in the
10:35:28
       23
            jury box -- let me just see a show of hands -- anybody who
10:35:30
10:35:33 24
            feels like they would lean more toward Group No. 2, who
            feel like maybe patents aren't such a hot idea in this day
10:35:38 25
```

```
and time when technology is changing? Anybody?
10:35:42
         1
                    How about over here in the -- the -- outside the
10:35:45
            jury box, is there anybody who feels that way?
10:35:47
                    If I could -- Mr. Johnston, if we could have the
10:35:50
         4
           microphone to Ms. Brown in the very back, Ms. Alana Brown.
10:35:58
10:36:07
                    Ms. Brown, I believe you mentioned in your
        6
            questionnaire form that you -- you had some concerns about
10:36:09
        7
            medical or maybe pharmaceutical patents. Did I get that
10:36:14
            right?
10:36:16
        9
                    JUROR ALANA BROWN: I don't remember exactly how I
10:36:17
       10
10:36:19
            answered. I don't necessarily have any concerns. I think
       11
            that other than potential of the price increasing because
10:36:23
       12
            of them -- of medication.
10:36:30
       13
                    MR. BUNT: Would that cause you to start out
10:36:32
        14
10:36:33
       15
            leaning against patent owners -- anything about that?
       16
                    JUROR ALANA BROWN: No.
10:36:38
                    MR. BUNT: Okay. Is there anybody who feels like
10:36:38
       17
            they have some views about patents that would cause them to
10:36:41
       18
            start out leaning against patent owners? I don't see any
10:36:44
       19
10:36:48
       20
           hands.
                    Okay. Mr. Johnston, if we could come back over to
10:36:49
       21
10:36:51
        22
           the jury box.
10:36:52
       23
                    Everybody has already heard, and you saw the
10:36:54
       24
           patent jury video this morning, you know from the patent
           video that patents are pieces of property. And when the
10:36:58 25
```

```
Patent Office issues a patent, it's like a deed that is
10:37:03
        1
          being issued.
10:37:06
                    So could I see a show of hands in the jury box,
10:37:07
         3
           how many of you are land owners, whether you own a house or
10:37:10
            whatever that your piece of land is sitting on?
10:37:15
        5
                    Okay. Let's just go to Ms. Harris -- Gayla
10:37:17
           Harris -- No. 3, I apologize.
10:37:21
        7
10:37:24
        8
                    Ms. Harris, you own a piece of land?
                    JUROR GAYLE HARRIS: Yes.
10:37:28
         9
                    MR. BUNT: And let me ask you this: If an oil
10:37:28
       10
           company -- oil and gas company, let's say, is drilling on
10:37:30
       11
10:37:34
       12
            your property without your permission, would you have any
10:37:38 13
           discomfort about going to court to get them off your
10:37:41 14
           property?
10:37:41 15
                    JUROR GAYLE HARRIS: No, I would not.
10:37:42 16
                    MR. BUNT: Okay. Mr. Johns -- Mr. Travis Johns,
          No. 4 --
10:37:48 17
10:37:48
       18
                    JUROR JOHNS: Yes, sir.
10:37:48 19
                    MR. BUNT: -- how about the same question?
10:37:51 20
                    JUROR JOHNS: No, I wouldn't -- I wouldn't like it
10:37:52 21
           either.
10:37:52 22
                    MR. BUNT: You don't have any discomfort about
10:37:55 23 going to court?
10:37:56 24
                    JUROR JOHNS: No.
10:37:57 25
                   MR. BUNT: Let me ask this: Does anybody feel
```

10:37:59 1 like intellectual property should be treated differently
10:38:04 2 than physical property, like a piece of land? Anybody in
10:38:07 3 the jury box feel that way?
10:38:09 4 Okay. I forgot to ask over here. Outside the

10:38:13

10:38:16

10:38:19

10:38:23

10:38:23

10:38:27

10:38:30

10:38:34

10:38:41

10:38:45

10:38:49

10:38:56

10:39:00

10:39:03

10:39:09

10:39:11

10:39:14

10:39:18

10:39:20

10:39:22

10:39:28 25

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

jury box, is there anybody here who feels like, you know what, I just don't feel comfortable with the idea of going to court to protect property rights? Anybody feel that way?

Is there anybody over on this side who feels like intellectual property, like a patent, should be treated differently than physical property, like a piece of land?

Okay. You're going to hear evidence during this trial about damages, and we're going to put on a financial expert who's going to explain to you the financial benefits that Wells Fargo has received using our property. And we anticipate at the end of the trial asking you if you agree that there's been infringement. And if you agree with our evidence, we're going to ask you to award \$102.8 million.

And I'll just tell you that Wells Fargo has an expert, a damage expert, who says even if they infringe, even if the patents are valid, they wouldn't owe any more than \$3.9 million.

So my question is, how many of you here in the jury box feel like no matter what the evidence is, even if you were able to find infringement, there's just no way you

```
could ever see yourself writing down a number of a hundred
10:39:30
         1
            million dollars? Is there anybody here in the jury box who
10:39:34
            feels that way?
10:39:37
         3
                    Mr. Meade, No. 6, any issues at all with that?
10:39:38
                    JUROR MEADE: No, sir.
10:39:47
         5
10:39:47
                    MR. BUNT: Okay. Mr. Nilsson, how about you?
         6
                    JUROR NILSSON: I believe we have to look at all
        7
10:39:50
            sides, and, I mean, if it's -- if it's 3 -- 3 million or
10:39:53
            102 million or something in the middle, you got to weigh it
10:39:58
            all out like the Judge said earlier.
10:40:01
        10
10:40:03
                    MR. BUNT: Thank you, sir. And let me -- I'll
        11
10:40:05
       12
            just follow up with that.
10:40:06
       13
                     If you could hand the microphone back.
                     I don't -- I'm not asking anybody here to commit
10:40:07
       14
10:40:11
        15
            to awarding a hundred million dollars, but I just want to
            know, if there's evidence to support that award, is there
10:40:13
       16
            anybody here who feels like they could not ever write down
10:40:16
       17
            that number? Anybody in the jury box?
10:40:20
       18
                    Anybody over here on this side of the courtroom
10:40:22
       19
10:40:24
       20
            who feels like -- yes, ma'am, Ms. -- Ms. Hilgenfeld?
       21
10:40:32
                     JUROR HILGENFELD: Let me -- I just have a
10:40:36 22
            question.
10:40:37 23
                    MR. BUNT: Yes, ma'am.
10:40:38 24
                    JUROR HILGENFELD: I mean, my concern is, doesn't
           all banks do this -- the same?
10:40:41 25
```

```
MR. BUNT: Well, the issue is whether USAA has a
10:40:44
         1
           patent on it and whether Wells Fargo is using our patent
10:40:47
           and benefitting from it.
10:40:50
                    JUROR HILGENFELD: So it doesn't matter if any
10:40:51
           other --
10:40:54
10:40:54
        6
                    MR. BUNT: No, ma'am. So -- but I --
                    JUROR HILGENFELD: So that's the -- that's one of
        7
10:40:57
           the reasons I would have.
10:40:59
        8
10:41:00
        9
                    MR. BUNT: I appreciate that.
                    JUROR HILGENFELD: And then --
10:41:02
       10
10:41:02
       11
                    THE COURT: We're here -- we're here about this
10:41:04 12 Plaintiff and this Defendant.
10:41:06 13
                    JUROR HILGENFELD: Okay.
                    THE COURT: And what may happen with other
10:41:06 14
          Plaintiffs and other Defendants is not a part of this
10:41:08 15
           trial.
10:41:10 16
                    JUROR HILGENFELD: Okay. I just know that
10:41:12 17
           different banks -- anyway. That's -- that was my concern.
10:41:13 18
                    MR. BUNT: Yes, ma'am. While I've got you,
10:41:18 19
10:41:21 20 | though --
10:41:21 21
                   JUROR HILGENFELD: Okay.
10:41:21
       22
                    MR. BUNT: -- you very graciously gave us a pretty
10:41:25 23
           good bit of information in your jury questionnaire form,
10:41:28 24
           and I did actually write down some of that information.
           You mentioned that Wells Fargo, the Defendant in this case,
10:41:31 25
```

```
is a major customer of your employer.
10:41:33
         1
10:41:36
                    JUROR HILGENFELD: Yes, sir.
         2
                    MR. BUNT: And I think you just mentioned, they --
10:41:36
         3
            they account for about 90 percent of the revenues or income
10:41:39
            of your company that you work for.
10:41:42
        5
                    JUROR HILGENFELD: Yes, sir.
10:41:44
         6
        7
                    MR. BUNT: And I believe you said that they've
10:41:45
            been a major customer for 20 years.
10:41:48
        8
10:41:50
                    JUROR HILGENFELD: At least 20 years.
         9
                    MR. BUNT: And I think you also said in your
10:41:52
        10
10:41:54
        11
            questionnaire form you felt like it would be a conflict of
            interest for you to serve on this jury.
10:41:57
       12
                    JUROR HILGENFELD: Yes, because I wasn't sure --
10:41:58
       13
                    MR. BUNT: No, that's fine --
10:42:01
       14
10:42:02
       15
                    JUROR HILGENFELD: -- the way it was going.
                    MR. BUNT: No, I -- I certainly appreciate it.
10:42:04
       16
            Let's just be frank, would it put you in a bad situation to
10:42:05
       17
10:42:11
       18
            serve on this jury?
10:42:12
       19
                    JUROR HILGENFELD: I have reservations that way,
10:42:15 20
           yes.
       21
10:42:15
                    MR. BUNT: Is my -- is my client starting off a
10:42:18
       22
            little bit behind of Wells Fargo simply because you deal
10:42:22
       23
            with Wells Fargo on a regular basis at your employment?
10:42:26 24
                    JUROR HILGENFELD: Yes, sir.
10:42:27 25
                    MR. BUNT: Thank you. Would you find it a little
```

```
hard to be fair and impartial to USAA, given your
10:42:29
        1
          particular situation?
10:42:32
         2
                    JUROR HILGENFELD: Possibility. Probability --
10:42:33
         3
                    MR. BUNT: I'm sorry, what's the last thing you
10:42:37
         4
           said?
10:42:40
        5
10:42:40
        6
                    JUROR HILGENFELD: Probability.
        7
                    MR. BUNT: Probability.
10:42:41
                    JUROR HILGENFELD: Yeah, if I'm being honest
10:42:42
         8
       9 because -- I mean, I would be fair as much as I could --
10:42:44
10:42:50 10
                    MR. BUNT: Yes, ma'am.
                    JUROR HILGENFELD: -- and listen to everything,
10:42:52
       11
           but I just -- I'm uneasy with working for them and -- but I
10:42:52
       12
           have family that uses USAA --
10:43:01
       13
10:43:02
       14
                    MR. BUNT: Yes, ma'am.
       15
10:43:04
                    JUROR HILGENFELD: -- so I don't know.
                    MR. BUNT: Would it -- let me ask this: Would it
10:43:06 16
           be a difficult conversation for you to go back to the
10:43:07 17
           office after a jury trial and say you had sat on a case and
       18
10:43:11
           you rendered a verdict against Wells Fargo?
10:43:16
       19
10:43:18 20
                    JUROR HILGENFELD: Yes, sir.
10:43:19 21
                    MR. BUNT: Thank you.
10:43:20 22
                    JUROR HILGENFELD: Because my name is on a lot of
10:43:22 23 checks.
10:43:23 24
                   MR. BUNT: I -- I appreciate your candor. I
          really do. Thank you, ma'am.
10:43:24 25
```

10:43:26 1 JUROR HILGENFELD: Thank you.

10:43:32

10:43:34

10:43:36

10:43:40

10:43:45

10:43:47

10:43:49

10:43:52

10:43:56

10:44:00

10:44:05

10:44:08

10:44:12

10:44:12

10:44:16

10:44:18

10:44:21

10:44:21

10:44:24

10:44:28

10:44:35

10:44:37

10:44:40

10:44:43 25

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. BUNT: I want to ask you some questions about invalidity. There's two different things you're going to hear about in this trial, infringement and invalidity. And USAA, my client, has to prove infringement, that is, that Wells Fargo is using our property without our permission. And we have to prove that by a preponderance of the evidence. And that's a burden we gladly accept.

Wells Fargo, on the other hand, has the burden to prove that the patents are invalid. It's not our burden to prove that the patents are valid. It's their burden to prove that they are invalid. And the burden of proof that they would have, if they want to do that, is to show by clear and convincing evidence.

Now, His Honor told you a little bit ago, preponderance of the evidence means tipping the scales, clear and convincing evidence means a more substantial burden of proof.

Is there anybody here -- and let's just start with the jury box -- who feels like that is unfair that we get to prove infringement by a preponderance of the evidence but that Wells Fargo would have to prove invalidity by clear and convincing, that there's a different burden of proof for them? Anybody have an issue with that? Not seeing any hands.

Over here on this side of the courtroom, if the 10:44:44 1 Judge tells you that is the burden of proof, is there 10:44:48 2 anybody here who would just have difficulty with that 10:44:50 10:44:52 concept? 4 10:44:53 5 Okay. Thank you. 10:44:54 Is -- I didn't tell you much, and you're going to 6 7 hear a lot more during the trial, but USAA, my client, 10:44:57 provides financial services to military and to military 10:45:01 10:45:04 families. These services include -- you've probably heard or seen insurance company ads for USAA, but they also 10:45:08 10 10:45:13 provide banking services. 11 12 Is there anybody here who has had a bad or 10:45:14 10:45:18 13 negative experience with USAA? And let me start in the jury box first? Anybody? 10:45:22 14 10:45:25 15 Okay. Over on this side, Mr. Mawer, Juror No. 21. JUROR MAWER: Yes. 10:45:33 16 MR. BUNT: Thank you. Did -- did you say that you 10:45:33 17 had a bad experience with USAA? 10:45:35 18 JUROR MAWER: It was good up until -- and I think 10:45:39 19 20 10:45:41 everybody kind of went up on their rates to the point that 21 we went shopping, but that was it. It wasn't -- it wasn't 10:45:45 10:45:48 22 anything on the services that they provided. We had 10:45:50 23 insurance with our house and our automobiles. 10:45:53 24 MR. BUNT: Okay. All right. Thank you, sir. I 10:45:55 25 appreciate that.

```
Is there anybody else who has had a negative
10:45:55
         1
          experience with USAA?
10:46:02
         2
                    Okay. Can I just see a show of hands, anybody
10:46:04
         3
            here on the jury panel who has worked at a bank?
10:46:07
                    Okay. No. 10, Ms. Walker, and let me -- raise
10:46:10
         5
10:46:16
           your hands high, please. No. 16, Ms. Hilgenfeld.
        7
                    And then on the back, Ms. Lorie Black --
10:46:22
10:46:22
         8
                    JUROR BLACK: Yes.
10:46:25
                    MR. BUNT: -- and then Ms. Brown. Okay. Thank
        9
10:46:30 10 you.
                    Mr. Bouzek, on -- Juror No. 1, did you serve in
10:46:30
       11
           the military?
10:46:36 12
                    JUROR BOUZEK: Yes, I did.
10:46:36
       13
                    MR. BUNT: And was that the Air Force?
10:46:37 14
10:46:39
       15
                    JUROR BOUZEK: Correct.
                    MR. BUNT: And how long did you serve?
10:46:40 16
10:46:42
                    JUROR BOUZEK: Four years.
       17
                    MR. BUNT: Okay. Thank you for your service.
10:46:43
       18
            don't think you said anything about you have USAA, but do
10:46:47
       19
10:46:50
       20
           you have any family members or friends who have USAA?
10:46:54
       21
                    JUROR BOUZEK: Not to my knowledge.
10:46:55
       22
                    MR. BUNT: Okay. Can I see a show of hands --
10:47:00 23
           thank you, sir. I appreciate it.
10:47:02 24
                    How many of you have used a phone to deposit a
10:47:04 25
           check before?
```

```
Okay. Juror -- if you don't mind, hold them up
10:47:07
         1
            again one more time. Juror No. 3, 4, 7, 10, 11, and 14,
10:47:10
         2
            and then 15, 16, 17 -- is that No. 23? Yes, ma'am. And
10:47:18
         3
            24, 26, and 28. Thank y'all very much.
10:47:26
                    The -- Wells Fargo is being represented by the
10:47:31
         5
10:47:36
            Winston & Strawn law firm. Mr. Tom Melsheimer here is one
            of the lawyers at that firm. They have offices all over
        7
10:47:40
            the country, but his office is in Dallas. I believe you're
10:47:43
         8
10:47:46
            going to hear from Ms. Williams -- Danielle Williams during
10:47:50
        10
            opening statement.
10:47:51
        11
                    Is there anybody here who knows Mr. Melsheimer or
            any of the other folks at Winston & Strawn?
10:47:54
        12
10:47:57
        13
                    Okay. Wells Fargo is also represented by
            Mr. Wesley Hill of the law firm of Ward Smith & Hill.
10:48:03
       14
        15
10:48:06
            That's based in Longview.
                     Is there anybody here who knows Mr. Hill or has
10:48:08
        16
            had any dealings with his law firm?
10:48:12
        17
                    Also, there's some folks at his firm. I'll just
10:48:13
        18
            list them out. Johnny Ward, Mr. T. John Ward, Mr. Bruce
10:48:17
        19
        20
10:48:22
            Smith, Claire Henry, Andrea Fair, Brett Miller, and Wendi
            Cavazos. Anybody here know any of those individuals?
10:48:29
        21
10:48:33
        22
                    Mr. Mike Collins is also assisting them with jury
10:48:34
       23
            selection. He's based in Tyler. Is there anybody here who
10:48:36
       24
            knows Mr. Collins?
                  Okay. Could I see a -- well, let me just start
10:48:44 25
```

```
with Ms. Gayla Harris, Juror No. 3.
10:48:50
        1
10:48:53
                    I believe you mentioned that you have -- that you
         2
            bank with Wells Fargo; is that right?
10:48:56
         3
10:48:58
                    JUROR GAYLE HARRIS: Yes. My husband takes care
            of all of our finances, so I'm trying to remember what we
10:49:05
            have or if we currently still have...
10:49:10
        7
                    MR. BUNT: Let me just ask it like this: Is there
10:49:13
            anything about that experience that would start you off
10:49:16
10:49:18
            leaning more towards Wells Fargo than USAA?
        9
                    JUROR GAYLE HARRIS: No, I didn't even actually
10:49:21
        10
10:49:23
        11
            remember we had services with them. And my husband said
            yes, we do -- or we did, so I don't have any good or bad
10:49:26
       12
10:49:31
        13
            experience.
                    MR. BUNT: Thank you, ma'am. I appreciate that.
10:49:31
       14
10:49:33
       15
                    Mr. Harris, Juror No. 12, did you indicate that
            you have Wells Fargo banking?
10:49:39
        17
                    JUROR KASSIDY HARRIS: They just have my mortgage.
10:49:42
                    MR. BUNT: All right. How about that, you
10:49:44
       18
10:49:48
       19
            understand I represent a company that is suing Wells Fargo,
10:49:52
        20
            you have Wells Fargo for your mortgage insurance company.
            Is that going to start my client in a worse position than
10:49:55
        21
10:50:03
       22
            Wells Fargo? Are you going to start off leaning a little
10:50:06
       23
            bit more towards Wells Fargo?
10:50:08
       24
                    JUROR KASSIDY HARRIS: Absolutely no.
                    MR. BUNT: Thank you, sir. I appreciate that.
10:50:09 25
```

```
Mr. Rankin, Juror No. 11, do you also have Wells
10:50:11
         1
            Fargo banking or have something to do with Wells Fargo?
10:50:16
            Could you tell me --
10:50:19
         3
                    JUROR RANKIN: Yes, I have Wells Fargo banking.
10:50:19
         4
                    MR. BUNT: Same question to you, how does that
10:50:21
         5
10:50:23
            make you feel?
                    JUROR RANKIN: I don't really have any personal
        7
10:50:25
            connection or feelings other than there's none around here.
10:50:27
        8
10:50:29
                    MR. BUNT: There's none --
        9
                    JUROR RANKIN: So I do use the picture -- you
10:50:31
        10
            know, the phone app.
10:50:33
       11
       12
                    MR. BUNT: Well, let me ask --
10:50:35
10:50:36
       13
                    JUROR RANKIN: Very often.
                    MR. BUNT: -- let me ask this: Would you worry in
10:50:38
       14
10:50:40
       15
            the back of your head whether if you were to find some sort
            of verdict in favor of USAA that it might end up somehow
10:50:43
       16
            down the road costing customers like yourself more money?
10:50:47
       17
                    JUROR RANKIN: I wouldn't think so.
10:50:51
       18
10:50:52
       19
                    MR. BUNT: All right. Thank you, sir. I
       20
10:50:54
            appreciate that.
       21
10:50:54
                    Mr. Cooper Terry -- Mr. -- Juror No. 24, do you
       22 bank with Wells Fargo also?
10:51:06
10:51:07 23
                    JUROR TERRY: I just have a corporate credit card
10:51:13 24 | that I -- it's a company card, so it's my expense card that
           I use, but it's Wells Fargo.
10:51:16 25
```

```
MR. BUNT: Same question I asked Mr. Rankin, how
10:51:17
         1
            would that make you feel sitting on this jury?
10:51:20
         2
                     JUROR TERRY: No effect.
10:51:22
         3
10:51:23
                     MR. BUNT: Okay. Thank you, sir.
         4
                     Mr. Strube, do we have Mr. Strube on the -- okay.
10:51:25
         5
10:51:32
            Never mind.
        7
                     Some of you had expressed some feelings -- strong
10:51:32
            feelings about lawsuits in your questionnaires.
10:51:42
         8
                     Mr. Mawer, Juror No. 21, I believe you indicated
10:51:45
            that you don't like frivolous lawsuits. Can you tell me a
10:51:49
        10
10:51:53
        11
            little bit more about that.
10:51:54
       12
                     JUROR MAWER: Ones that really don't have any
            merit. I didn't know about this case, obviously, but
10:51:56
       13
            the -- somebody suing somebody for hot coffee or whatever
10:52:00
       14
            when it has a warning on it, that's pretty much the extent
10:52:04
       15
            of that.
10:52:06
       16
                     MR. BUNT: Well, you understand that you have a
10:52:07
       17
            feeling against what you consider to be frivolous lawsuits,
10:52:10
       18
            and I'm representing somebody who has brought a lawsuit. I
10:52:13
       19
10:52:16
       20
            certainly don't think there's anything frivolous about this
            at all.
10:52:18
       21
10:52:19
       22
                     JUROR MAWER: Okay.
10:52:20 23
                     MR. BUNT: But am I starting off a little bit
10:52:22 24
            behind in your mind simply because of those feelings you
10:52:25 25
            have about --
```

```
10:52:27
         1
                    JUROR MAWER: No, sir.
                    MR. BUNT: -- lawsuits? Thank you, sir.
10:52:27
         2
                    Are there any others, let's say, in the jury box
10:52:30
         3
            that have strong feelings about lawsuits that would make it
10:52:33
         4
            difficult for you to sit on this jury panel? Anybody?
10:52:38
         5
                    How about over on this side?
10:52:40
         6
        7
                     Is there anybody on the jury panel over here -- on
10:52:42
10:52:54
            the jury box who -- who has applied for a patent or has a
         8
            family member or a friend who has applied for a patent?
10:52:57
        9
                    Yes, ma'am, Ms. Fisher, you said your stepson, I
10:53:01
        10
            believe; is that right?
10:53:07
        11
10:53:08
       12
                    JUROR FISHER: Yes, sir.
10:53:09
       13
                    MR. BUNT: Can you tell me what -- what sort of
10:53:11
       14
            patent that was about?
10:53:13
       15
                    JUROR FISHER: It was something -- he worked for
            the government. It was something that was top secret.
10:53:14
       16
            I really don't know a lot about that.
10:53:18
        17
10:53:21
        18
                    MR. BUNT: Okay. Was he able to obtain the
10:53:23
       19
            patent?
10:53:24
       20
                    JUROR FISHER: I don't remember exactly how that
10:53:26
       21
            came out, if the government patented it or if he was
        22
            actually the one that got to patent it.
10:53:29
10:53:31
        23
                    MR. BUNT: Okay. Anything about that experience
10:53:33 24
           that'd make it hard to sit on this panel?
10:53:37 25
                    JUROR FISHER: None.
```

```
10:53:37
         1
                    MR. BUNT: Thank you.
                    Ms. -- Ms. Sheryl Redmon -- no, okay.
10:53:38
         2
                    Is there anybody else who has applied for a patent
10:53:45
         3
            or has a family member or a friend who has applied for a
10:53:48
            patent or obtained a patent? Is there anybody here who
10:53:52
        5
            works for companies that own patents?
10:53:56
        7
                    Yes, sir, Mr. Mawer, remind me where you work.
10:54:01
                    JUROR MAWER: Weatherford International, it's an
10:54:06
         8
            oil and gas company.
10:54:08
                    MR. BUNT: Okay. Do you know how they enforce
10:54:09
       10
          their property rights, their patent rights?
10:54:11
        11
10:54:13 12
                    JUROR MAWER: I don't. I've never been involved
           in it.
10:54:15
       13
10:54:16
       14
                    MR. BUNT: Okay. Thank you.
10:54:17
       15
                    Is there anybody here who has ever been sued?
            Let's see, in the jury box, ever been a Defendant in a
10:54:21
            lawsuit? How about over on this side? Anybody?
10:54:24
       17
       18
                    Okay. Mr. Bouzek, your niece -- I keep coming
10:54:28
            back to you, Juror No. 1. Your niece, you indicated, has a
10:54:35
       19
       20
10:54:37
            law degree; is that right?
                    JUROR BOUZEK: That's correct.
10:54:38
       21
10:54:41
        22
                    MR. BUNT: And where does she work, if you know?
10:54:44
       23
                    JUROR BOUZEK: I don't know right now.
10:54:46 24
                    MR. BUNT: Okay. Do you know what kind of law she
10:54:49 25
           does?
```

```
JUROR BOUZEK: Has a medical nature to it.
10:54:49
         1
                    MR. BUNT: Okay. I take it there's nothing about
10:54:53
         2
        3 | that that will make it hard to sit on this jury?
10:54:55
10:54:57
        4
                    JUROR BOUZEK: No, sir.
                    MR. BUNT: Okay. Ms. Fisher, Juror No. 5, I may
10:54:58
         5
        6 have written this down wrong, but did you say that your
10:55:04
           stepdaughter works at a law office?
10:55:08 7
10:55:10
         8
                   JUROR FISHER: She did when she was in high
           school.
10:55:12
       9
                    MR. BUNT: Okay.
10:55:12 10
10:55:13 11
                    JUROR FISHER: She -- she doesn't now.
                   MR. BUNT: That doesn't have any bearing; is that
10:55:14 12
10:55:15 13 | right?
10:55:16 14
                    JUROR FISHER: Right.
10:55:16 15
                    MR. BUNT: Okay. Thank you.
                    Mr. -- no, let's see, Ms. Cheryl Jones, sorry,
10:55:17 16
            Juror No. 2, yes, ma'am. Your daughter, does she work at a
10:55:28
       17
           law firm?
       18
10:55:32
                    JUROR JONES: Yes.
10:55:32 19
10:55:33 20
                    MR. BUNT: Which law firm is that?
10:55:36 21
                    JUROR JONES: In Longview, Randy Akin.
10:55:37 22
                    MR. BUNT: Okay. What does she do there for him?
10:55:39 23
                    JUROR JONES: She's a paralegal.
10:55:40 24
                    MR. BUNT: Okay. How long has she done that?
10:55:42 25
                    JUROR JONES: She's done it for 15, something like
```

```
10:55:45 1 that.
                   MR. BUNT: Okay. Thank you, ma'am. I sure
10:55:45
10:55:47 3 appreciate that.
                   THE COURT: You have five minutes remaining,
10:55:49
        5 | counsel.
10:55:51
10:55:51
        6
                   MR. BUNT: Thank you, Your Honor.
        7
                   Are there any jurors here who know one another or
10:55:51
           who may be related to one another? You'd be surprised how
10:55:56 8
10:56:01
           often that shows up.
                    Sorry, yes, sir, No. 6?
10:56:05 10
10:56:09 11
                    JUROR MEADE: Yes.
10:56:10 12
                   MR. BUNT: Tell me who you know.
                   JUROR MEADE: That'd be No. 14 back here,
10:56:12 13
10:56:16 14 Ms. Pate.
                   MR. BUNT: And how do you -- is it Mr. Richardson
10:56:17 15
10:56:19 16 | that you know --
10:56:19 17
                   JUROR MEADE: No.
10:56:20 18
                   MR. BUNT: -- or, no --
                   JUROR MEADE: Ms. Pate.
10:56:22 19
10:56:23 20
                   MR. BUNT: Ms. Pate. I apologize. How do you
10:56:27 21 know Ms. Pate?
10:56:28 22
                    JUROR MEADE: She was older than I was, but we all
10:56:29 23 went to the same high school. And we coached tee ball
10:56:36 24 against each other and so...
10:56:36 25
                MR. BUNT: I don't think she liked it when you
```

```
10:56:37 1 said she's older than you. Okay. So y'all --- y'all were
        2 at the same school together coaching?
10:56:41
                    JUROR MEADE: No, as far as tee ball goes, our
10:56:43
        3
           kids played against each other, and I mean, we were in the
10:56:46
           same town.
10:56:48
        5
10:56:49
                    MR. BUNT: Okay. Would -- would that create any
        7 | difficulties for you in sitting on this jury panel?
10:56:51
                    JUROR MEADE: I don't think so.
10:56:55
        8
                    MR. BUNT: Okay. Anybody else who knows one
10:56:56
       9
10:56:58 10 another on the jury panel?
10:57:01 11
                   Yes, sir, Mr. Richardson?
10:57:03 12
                   JUROR RICHARDSON: No. 2, Cheryl, friends. Cheryl
10:57:09 13 Jones.
                   MR. BUNT: Okay. And how do y'all know each
10:57:09 14
10:57:18 15 other?
10:57:18 16
                   JUROR RICHARDSON: Just from way past.
                   MR. BUNT: All right.
10:57:18 17
                    JUROR RICHARDSON: Distant friends. We dated
10:57:20 18
10:57:21 19 actually for a little while.
10:57:21 20
                    MR. BUNT: Okay. We're learning lots of
10:57:21 21 information.
10:57:22 22
                    JUROR RICHARDSON: We lost touch.
10:57:22 23
                   MR. BUNT: Well, let's see what else we can find
10:57:23 24 out.
10:57:23 25
                   THE COURT: That's the first time I've heard that
```

```
10:57:24
         1
           one.
10:57:32
                    MR. BUNT: That's right.
         2
                    JUROR RICHARDSON: She said sit down.
10:57:32
         3
                    MR. BUNT: Well, given that past, would it --
10:57:32
         4
            would that --
10:57:35
        5
10:57:35
                    JUROR RICHARDSON: Not at all.
        6
         7
                    MR. BUNT: -- have some difficulties?
10:57:36
10:57:37
         8
                    JUROR RICHARDSON: Not at all.
10:57:39
                    MR. BUNT: Okay. Who else did we see a hand
         9
           raised on?
10:57:42
       10
10:57:43
       11
                    No. 12, Mr. Harris, who do you know on the panel?
                    JUROR KASSIDY HARRIS: Yes. Ms. Harris. We're
10:57:45
       12
           actually not related, but we do attend church together.
10:57:46
       13
                    MR. BUNT: Okay. Anything about that that would
10:57:50
       14
           make it difficult to sit on the jury panel?
10:57:52
       15
                    JUROR KASSIDY HARRIS: Absolutely not.
10:57:54
       16
                    MR. BUNT: While I've got you, though, let me ask
10:57:55
       17
           this: If you had a difference of opinion from her, would
10:57:58
       18
            it be awkward to have that difference of opinion while
10:58:02
       19
10:58:06
       20
            you're deliberating on a case if you know each other so
           well from church?
10:58:10
       21
10:58:11
        22
                    JUROR KASSIDY HARRIS: No.
10:58:12 23
                    MR. BUNT: Okay. Thank you. Who else --
10:58:13 24
                    JUROR KASSIDY HARRIS: Not for me anyway.
10:58:15 25
                    MR. BUNT: Let me -- let me qo back to Ms. Harris,
```

```
give you a moment for rebuttal from everybody. Would
10:58:18
         1
10:58:20
            that -- would that case you any -- any concern?
                     JUROR GAYLE HARRIS: No, not at all.
10:58:26
         3
                     MR. BUNT: Okay. One follow-up question.
10:58:28
         4
            invention that USAA invented has to do with a system that
10:58:36
10:58:42
            can be used with many different consumer devices. Is there
        7
            anybody here who would find it hard to rule on a case where
10:58:45
10:58:49
            the system can apply to many different devices, like
         8
10:58:52
            digital cameras, scanners, or -- or smartphones, iPhones,
            anything about that that would cause difficulty to you?
10:58:57
        10
10:59:00
        11
                     JUROR NILSSON: Can you repeat the question one
        12
            more time?
10:59:02
                     MR. BUNT: Sure. This invention has to do with a
10:59:02
        13
            way of using many different consumer devices to take great
10:59:04
        14
10:59:08
        15
            pictures that are going to be able to use -- to be used to
            deposit checks. Is there anything that would make -- about
10:59:12
        16
            that that would make it hard for you to sit on this jury,
10:59:15
        17
            ruling on a system that can apply to many different
10:59:19
        18
            devices? Anything about that, sir?
10:59:24
        19
10:59:27
        20
                     JUROR NILSSON: No, I don't think so. I just
            wanted to understand your question correctly.
10:59:28
        21
10:59:30
        22
                     MR. BUNT: I appreciate that.
10:59:31
        23
                     One final question, and I'm sure I missed
10:59:34
        24
            something, if there's some reason you feel like this is not
            the right case for you, that I've failed to ask you
10:59:37
        25
```

```
something, and if I had, you would -- it's something that I
10:59:41
         1
            would really want to know. If for whatever reason you feel
10:59:43
            like this is not the case for you, please raise your hand.
10:59:47
            If it's something you don't want to take up in front of
10:59:49
            everybody, you want to take up privately with the Judge, we
10:59:52
         5
            can do this. But this is the last chance. If you feel
10:59:56
            like this is not the right case for you, please raise your
11:00:00
        7
            hand and let me know.
11:00:04
        8
                    Okay. Thank you so much, ladies and gentlemen.
11:00:05
            appreciate your time and attention, and we look forward to
11:00:05
       10
11:00:08
            putting on our case.
        11
                    THE COURT: Mr. Hill, you may address the panel on
11:00:09
       12
           behalf of the Defendant.
11:00:11
       13
                    MR. HILL: Thank you, Your Honor.
11:00:11
       14
11:00:15
       15
                    THE COURT: And you'd like a five-minute warning,
11:00:17
       16
            as well?
                    MR. HILL: Yes, sir, please.
11:00:17
        17
                    THE COURT: All right. You may proceed.
11:00:18
       18
11:00:19
       19
                    MR. HILL: Thank you.
       20
11:00:20
                    Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.
                    As I mentioned to you earlier, my name is Wesley
11:00:21
        21
       22
            Hill. And to give fair disclosure, the information y'all
11:00:25
11:00:30
       23
            gave us, I'll give you the same.
11:00:30
       24
                    I'm married. I -- my wife's name is Catherine.
            We've got a 25-year-old son that's a school teacher in
11:00:35 25
```

Austin and a 12-year-old little girl that's a 7th grader
and a tennis player. I grew up in Murchison over in
Henderson County. That's over closer to Athens.

My law firm is based in Longview. It's called Ward Smith & Hill, that Mr. Bunt mentioned to you earlier. That's my firm with me and my partners. And along with my co-counsel here, I'm proud to represent Wells Fargo in this case.

Now, folks, I only get 30 minutes to talk to you this morning. So I want to spend my time this morning focused on what's most important to me, and that's you, okay?

I want to start by saying thank you because I know that jury service is an imposition on your time. I know that it is a pain to have to disrupt your schedule, your life, show up at the courthouse early one morning, sit around, watch videos about things you might not find that interesting, and then have lawyers talk at you for a couple of hours, okay? Not to mention the service and the time imposition that will exist for those of you who serve on this jury. So I wanted to first, right out of the box, tell you, thank you very much for being here. You're what makes the system work.

Now, Mr. Bunt had some things to say about USAA's claims in this case. He talks about what their claims in

11:01:00 9 11:01:04 10

8

11:01:00

11:01:07 11

11:01:24 16

11:01:31 17

11:01:31 18

11:01:34 19

11:01:37 20

11:01:40 21

11:01:44 22

11:01:47 23

11:01:48 24

11:01:52 25

this case are. And because I want to talk to you, all I'm going to say at this point is that Wells Fargo respects
USAA, but we disagree with just about everything Mr. Bunt had to say about the claims in these case -- in this case and the patents in this case.

And those of you -- that's why we're here is to get to present that dispute. And those of you who serve on this jury are going to get a chance to hear the full story of that dispute and hear why I tell you that we disagree with USAA and look forward to getting to show that to those of you that -- that serve.

Now, folks, the reason we go through this process, the reason we take all this time to talk to everybody, you fill out the questionnaires, you answer the questions that the Judge has you stand up and answer, is we're trying to find a jury that's committed to being fair to both sides, okay? Fair to both sides.

And so what does that mean? Think about that.

Think about if -- if you had an important case, what would it mean for you for the jury to be fair to both sides? And I'll start out with Juror No. 1 here. Mr. Bouzek, let me -- let me ask, what would it mean to you for a jury to be fair to both sides?

JUROR BOUZEK: It would be very important to me if I was on trial or my company.

11:02:34 12 11:02:36 13 11:02:40 14 11:02:42 15 11:02:45 16 11:02:50 17

18

23

11:02:51

11:03:19 24 11:03:20 25

11:03:17

```
MR. HILL: Okay. Does it mean that that jury
11:03:22
         1
            doesn't start out leaning one way or the other?
11:03:25
         2
                    JUROR BOUZEK: Absolutely.
11:03:28
         3
11:03:29
                    MR. HILL: Doesn't start out pre-disposed?
         4
                    JUROR BOUZEK: That's correct.
11:03:32
         5
11:03:32
                    MR. HILL: All right. Thank you, sir.
         6
        7
                    Let me ask just you to pass the microphone down
11:03:35
11:03:38
            there to Juror No. 2 next to you.
        8
                    Ms. Jones --
11:03:41
        9
11:03:41
        10
                    JUROR JONES: Yes.
11:03:41
                    MR. HILL: -- I'm going to ask you, what does it
        11
            mean to you for a jury to be fair to both sides?
11:03:42
       12
11:03:45
       13
                    JUROR JONES: Same thing. I mean, he -- exactly
            what he was talking about.
11:03:46
       14
11:03:47
        15
                    MR. HILL: Let me ask you this: Does it mean that
            the jury doesn't make their mind up early based on who the
11:03:48
            parties are or what they think they know about them coming
11:03:53
       17
            in?
11:03:56
       18
                    JUROR JONES: Correct.
11:03:57
       19
11:03:58
       20
                    MR. HILL: All right. Does anybody disagree with
            Ms. Jones? Everybody agree that for a jury to be fair to
11:04:01
        21
11:04:06
       22
            both sides, it doesn't mean they make their mind up early
11:04:10
       23
            or come in deciding things based on what they think they
11:04:13 24
            know?
11:04:14 25
                    Let me ask -- we'll start there on the back row
```

```
since we've got some -- you're there close, Mr. Johnston.
11:04:16
        1
11:04:21
                     Juror No. 9, that's Ms. Manning?
         2
                    JUROR MANNING: Yes.
11:04:21
         3
                    MR. HILL: Ms. Manning, what do you think it means
11:04:24
         4
            for a jury to be fair to both sides?
11:04:26
11:04:28
                     JUROR MANNING: Well, I think it should be equal
         6
           to both of them.
        7
11:04:32
                     MR. HILL: Do you think it -- do you think it
11:04:34
        8
11:04:36
            means that you hear all the evidence before you make up
11:04:39
        10
            your mind on what the real story is?
11:04:42
        11
                     JUROR MANNING: Well, I have to see what -- what
11:04:47
        12
            the story about before I could say.
                     MR. HILL: Is there anybody right now -- and let
11:04:51
        13
            me -- I'll start with you, Ms. Manning. Is there anybody
11:04:53
       14
            right now, because maybe of what you think of USAA or maybe
11:04:55
       15
            because of something Mr. Bunt had to say this morning when
11:05:01
       16
            he was talking to you about USAA and their claims, that you
11:05:05
       17
            feel like that, in fairness, you ought to tell us, you
11:05:08
       18
            know, I think I might start out leaning a bit their way?
11:05:15
       19
11:05:19
       20
            Do you feel that way?
        21
11:05:21
                     JUROR MANNING: No.
11:05:22
       22
                     MR. HILL: No, ma'am?
11:05:22 23
                     JUROR MANNING: No, sir.
11:05:22 24
                    MR. HILL: You feel that way?
11:05:25 25
                    JUROR MANNING: No, sir, no, sir.
```

11:05:27	1	MR. HILL: We start out equal footing?
11:05:29	2	JUROR MANNING: Yes.
11:05:29	3	MR. HILL: Thank you very much. I appreciate it.
11:05:30	4	Let me ask this: Is there anybody else that has
11:05:33	5	opinions about because of the opinions they hold about
11:05:35	6	USAA or the opinions that they hold about Wells Fargo, that
11:05:39	7	you feel like you start out in this case maybe a little
11:05:44	8	predisposed, and you're not the person for this case for
11:05:50	9	this case that can be that juror that is a hundred percent
11:05:54	10	fair on both sides? Anybody?
11:05:57	11	Now, look, if if you do lean one way or another
11:06:03	12	on something, there's nothing wrong with that. That
11:06:05	13	doesn't mean you don't get to serve on a jury. All it
11:06:08	14	means is that we've got to make full disclosure here so
11:06:12	15	that the parties know where they start, okay?
11:06:14	16	And let me ask first I'll go back to Juror
11:06:20	17	No. 1 here, Mr. Bouzek, you had some things to say in the
11:06:22	18	questionnaire about Wells Fargo.
11:06:25	19	JUROR BOUZEK: Yes.
11:06:26	20	MR. HILL: And past experiences you had with the
11:06:29	21	company.
11:06:29	22	JUROR BOUZEK: Correct.
11:06:30	23	MR. HILL: Do you believe those past experiences
11:06:32	24	start you out with a where we start out a little bit
11:06:37	25	behind?

```
JUROR BOUZEK: No, I don't think so. It's been
11:06:38
         1
11:06:42
            years ago, and, you know, if it was closer to that time,
         2
            I'd say yeah --
11:06:46
         3
11:06:47
         4
                    MR. HILL: Okav.
                    JUROR BOUZEK: -- anyhow.
11:06:47
         5
11:06:49
                    MR. HILL: Okay. Nothing that you think would
         6
            influence your ability to be that impartial jury where that
11:06:52
        7
            I as a lawyer for Wells Fargo should have concerns about
11:06:55
         8
11:07:01
            anything from your past interactions with the company.
                    JUROR BOUZEK: I don't think so.
11:07:03
       10
                    MR. HILL: All right. It certainly
11:07:04
        11
            didn't have anything to do with patents, did it?
11:07:04
       12
11:07:06
       13
                    JUROR BOUZEK: No, sir.
11:07:06
       14
                    MR. HILL: Thank you very much.
11:07:07
       15
                    Also, by the same token, we had Ms. --
            Ms. Hilgenfeld over here, yes, ma'am, can I talk to you for
11:07:11
            just a second? Now, you mentioned your business works a
11:07:14
       17
            lot for Wells Fargo --
11:07:18
       18
11:07:20
       19
                    JUROR HILGENFELD: Yes, sir.
       20
11:07:20
                    MR. HILL: -- is that right? And you think
            because of that that you might start out predisposed?
11:07:21
        21
11:07:25
       22
                    JUROR HILGENFELD: I honestly can't tell you.
11:07:32
       23
            mean, I don't know for sure. I mean, since it's a patent
11:07:35
       24
            case, but at the same time, if they were sued --
11:07:46 25
                    MR. HILL: Uh-huh.
```

```
JUROR HILGENFELD: -- or if they lost, then, you
11:07:47
         1
            know, that may have bearings. I don't -- I'm kind of
11:07:50
            wishy-washy there.
11:07:54
         3
                     MR. HILL: Okay. Let me ask this question: Who
11:07:55
            in the jury panel thinks the folks at USAA's table ought to
11:07:57
11:08:02
            be concerned a little bit if Ms. Hilgenfeld was on the
            jury?
11:08:05
        7
                     Okay. I think we all kind of see that. I mean,
11:08:07
         8
11:08:10
            she's got a business that -- that gets a lot of work from
            Wells Fargo, and that doesn't mean she's not fair-minded.
11:08:13
        10
            It doesn't mean she wouldn't sit and consider the evidence
11:08:16
        11
            fairly, but it means she would start out because of her
11:08:19
        12
11:08:23
        13
            experience with Wells Fargo probably in a way that would
            make them a little uncomfortable, probably in a way that
11:08:25
        14
            would make people on the street looking at this trial think
11:08:28
        15
            maybe there was something going on there, maybe they didn't
11:08:32
        16
            get a fair shake, okay? Everybody see that?
11:08:34
        17
11:08:38
        18
                     Thank you, Ms. Hilgenfeld.
11:08:40
       19
                     JUROR HILGENFELD: Thank you.
        20
11:08:41
                    MR. HILL: Appreciate that.
11:08:41
        21
                     And, folks, the reason I bring that up, is there
11:08:44
        22
            anybody -- that works both ways. Is there anybody that has
11:08:48
        23
            a relationship with USAA or opinions about USAA that makes
11:08:52
        24
            you feel like I might be a little bit in Ms. Hilgenfeld's
            camp, if -- if Mr. Hill up there knew what I think about
11:08:57
        25
```

USAA, it might look like I start out a little slanted? You 11:09:02 1 11:09:07 know, it doesn't mean you're not fair-minded, it just means it's how you view folks, it's how you view the parties in 11:09:09 the case. Anybody? 11:09:13 All right. I appreciate that. 11:09:14 5 11:09:16 Now, ladies and gentlemen, before I get too far, 6 let me ask the obvious questions that lawyers have to ask 7 11:09:20 in these things and, that is, do you know anybody here on 11:09:23 8 11:09:26 the other side? So we'll start out, you've got the lawyers in this 11:09:27 10 11:09:30 11 case for USAA, is a law firm called Irell & Manella, and 11:09:36 12 their lead lawyer in this case is a gentleman named Mr. Jason Sheasby. He's from Los Angeles. And does anyone 11:09:40 13 here have any connection or has ever heard of or know 11:09:42 14 11:09:45 15 anything about the law firm Irell & Manella? Anybody? All right. And you previously met Mr. Bunt. 11:09:50 16 Mr. Bunt is from Tyler. He is with a firm called Parker 11:09:53 17 Bunt and Ainsworth, and Mr. Bunt and his wife's family, the 11:09:59 18 Parkers, are from the Hallsville area originally. Does 11:10:02 19 11:10:07 20 anybody here have any connection to Mr. Bunt, heard of his 21 law firm, or you think you know either the Bunts or the 11:10:10 11:10:14 22 Parkers from the Hallsville area? Anybody? 11:10:20 23 All right. Oh, I'm sorry. 11:10:23 24 JUROR RANKIN: I know some of the Parkers that 11:10:25 25 work in the high school.

```
THE COURT: Let's get the microphone and let you
11:10:25
         1
11:10:27
          stand up, please, sir.
         2
                    MR. HILL: Thank you. That's Mr. Rankin.
11:10:29
         3
                    JUROR RANKIN: Yes, I know a couple of the Parkers
11:10:32
         4
            that work at the high school, but I was not -- unaware
11:10:34
        5
11:10:36
            there was any connections.
        7
                    MR. HILL: So you know some Parkers, but you don't
11:10:38
            know them to be Mr. Bunt's in-laws?
11:10:40
        8
11:10:43
                    JUROR RANKIN: No, sir.
        9
                    MR. HILL: Thank you very much. Anybody else?
11:10:44
       10
11:10:46
                    Now, there's one other person I'd like to mention,
       11
            Mr. Todd Parish. Mr. Parish is assisting USAA with the
11:10:49
       12
            jury selection in the case. Is there anybody that knows
11:10:53 13
            Mr. Parish?
11:11:00
       14
11:11:01
       15
                    All right. Now, as I mentioned earlier, USAA is
            the Plaintiff in this case, and according to Wikipedia,
11:11:05
       16
            USAA is the United Services Automobile Association --
11:11:09
       17
            that's what that stands for -- in San Antonio. It is a
11:11:15
       18
            diversified financial services group of companies including
11:11:19
       19
       20
11:11:22
            a Texas Department of Insurance regulated reciprocal
       21
            insurance exchange. And it has subsidiaries offering
11:11:27
            banking, investing, and insurance.
11:11:30
       22
11:11:32
       23
                     Is there anyone here who is a USAA customer --
11:11:38 24
          USAA customer? Let me see your hands here. So we've got
           No. 6, that's Mr. Meade, okay, we've got No. 19, that's
11:11:42 25
```

```
Mr. Pickens. Who else do we have out there? No. 22.
11:11:46
        1
11:11:53
                     JUROR NEELEY: My wife is.
         2
                     MR. HILL: Your wife is, okay, and that's
11:11:55
         3
            Mr. Neelev?
11:11:59
        4
                     JUROR NEELEY: Yes.
11:12:00
         5
11:12:01
                    MR. HILL: All right. Who else, Ms. Black?
         6
        7
                    Anybody I miss? USAA customer or maybe your
11:12:04
            spouse is?
11:12:07
        8
11:12:08
                    All right. Thank you.
        9
                     Now, those of you who -- one thing you're going to
11:12:09
        10
11:12:19
        11
            hear, those of you that serve on the panel and also those
            of you just from everyday life may know, is that USAA,
11:12:22
        12
            they're an insurance company, but they also have banking
11:12:27
        13
            services. And that's part of what's at issue in this case.
11:12:29
       14
            And they limit their services -- their insurance services
11:12:32
       15
            or their banking services to current or former members of
11:12:37
        16
            the military and their families, okay. That's what USAA
11:12:40
       17
            does. That's who they sell to.
11:12:43
       18
                     Does hearing that cause anybody to feel like they
11:12:46
       19
       20
11:12:49
            thought -- they start off more on the USAA side because
            they try to service military families? Anybody?
11:12:54
        21
11:12:58
        22
                     Does anybody here recall seeing USAA ads on TV?
11:13:04
       23
            Let me see hands. How many of you have see them?
11:13:09 24
                    All right. Does anybody recall anything from
11:13:11 25
           those ads?
```

Who do we have -- Mr. Bouzek. Do you -- tell me 11:13:12 1 11:13:15 about that. What -- what do you recall from those ads? 2 JUROR BOUZEK: Just that, that they service prior 11:13:18 3 service members, and that's what sticks in my mind. 11:13:22 4 MR. HILL: Okay. 11:13:25 5 11:13:26 JUROR BOUZEK: So that's what I remember about 6 them, car, house, whatever. 11:13:28 7 11:13:29 8 MR. HILL: Is there anything about the advertising that you folks have seen that cause you to think you start 11:13:31 out having a more favorable view of USAA? Do those ads 11:13:34 10 cause any of you to have just generally more favorable 11:13:40 11 views of USAA? Do they cause any of you to have more 11:13:45 12 negative views of USAA? 11:13:50 13 Okay. Thank you, sir. I appreciate it. 11:13:53 14 11:13:58 15 Let me ask similarly about Wells Fargo. Okay. Wells Fargo also has television ads. Does anybody recall 11:14:02 17 seeing Wells Fargo ads? Let me see your hands. Is there 11:14:05 anything about that advertising that makes anybody lean one 11:14:10 18 way or the other? 11:14:13 19 20 11:14:14 Now, this case involves two corporations, as we've shown. They're both large. They're both successful. And 11:14:21 21 11:14:25 22 is there anybody that, because of that, you have feelings 11:14:30 23 about big corporations generally? Some people don't like 11:14:33 24 them. Some people think it's a big corporation, I don't really care for them. Anybody share that feeling, feel 11:14:39 25

```
1 that way?
11:14:44
11:14:46
                    Is there anybody who is concerned about big
            corporations or think they ought to be subject to some sort
11:14:51
            of government regulation? Anyone?
11:14:54
                    All right. Let me ask -- Mr. Bunt asked those of
11:14:58
         5
11:15:04
            you that knew each other. I think there were a couple of
            others he may have missed. Let me see the hands again of
11:15:07
11:15:11
            jurors that know one another.
        8
11:15:12
                    All right. Back here in the back. We have Mr. --
           No. 22, that's Mr. Neeley.
11:15:14
       10
11:15:16
       11
                    JUROR NEELEY: Yes, sir.
                    MR. HILL: Mr. Neeley, tell me who you know.
11:15:17 12
11:15:19
       13
                    JUROR NEELEY: Cooper Terry, me and him used to
11:15:23 14
          work together.
                    MR. HILL: Okay. Where did y'all work?
11:15:23 15
                    JUROR NEELEY: Fastenal.
11:15:25
       16
                    MR. HILL: All right. Are y'all friends today or
11:15:26
       17
           just former work associates?
11:15:28
       18
                    JUROR NEELEY: Former work associates.
11:15:31
       19
       20
11:15:34
                    MR. HILL: All right. Thank you, sir. Anything
11:15:35
       21
            about that, Mr. Neeley, that if you and Mr. Terry both
11:15:39
       22
            ended up on the jury that you think would be hard for you?
11:15:43 23
                    JUROR NEELEY: No, sir.
11:15:43 24
                    MR. HILL: If you and he disagreed, would you be
           able to do that based on the fact that you know each other?
11:15:47 25
```

JUROR NEELEY: Yes, sir. 11:15:50 1 11:15:51 MR. HILL: All righty. Is there anybody who did 2 know folks on the jury who thinks, you know, if I got in a 11:15:55 jury room and me and that other person saw it different, 11:15:57 that might be an uncomfortable situation for me because of 11:16:02 11:16:04 that past relationship? Was that a concern for anybody? 11:16:07 All right. 7 Now, folks, as you heard in the video this 11:16:07 8 11:16:12 morning, this is a patent case, and the patent system is based on a bargain between the government and the inventor. 11:16:15 10 11:16:20 And as the video explained this morning, if you have 11 something that's new and what patent lawyers call novel and 11:16:23 12 if you clearly specify and describe that invention, tell 11:16:28 13 others how to make it in your patent and the Patent Office 11:16:31 14 11:16:34 15 agrees that it's new and novel and you've done those things, then you can get a government-granted monopoly on 11:16:37 16 11:16:43 that. You can get a patent on it. That's what a patent 17 is. And it's good for about 20 years, and after that it 11:16:46 18 belongs to everybody. The ideas in that patent belong to 11:16:49 19 11:16:52 20 everybody. 21 Is there anybody who didn't realize before the 11:16:52 11:16:55 22 video today that that's effectively what a patent is, is a 11:16:59 23 government -- government-granted exclusivity, a 11:17:03 24 government-granted monopoly? 11:17:04 25 Was that a surprise to anybody?

```
Now, is there anybody that came to court today
11:17:09
         1
            with any feelings about the Patent Office or you had an
11:17:13
         2
            opinion, you thought about it in the past? It crossed your
11:17:16
         3
            mind and you have an opinion about the Patent Office?
11:17:20
                     For instance, does anybody come here today feeling
11:17:23
         5
            like the Patent Office generally does a pretty good job of
11:17:26
            vetting patent applications and deciding whether to issue
11:17:30
        7
11:17:33
            patents? Anybody come here today thinking that?
         8
                     Let me call out somebody and ask. Let's start on
11:17:37
            the back row here, No. 12, Mr. Harris, let me ask you that
11:17:40
        10
            question. Coming into court today, did you have any just
11:17:51
        11
            preconceived notion of the quality of the work the Patent
11:17:54
        12
            Office does?
11:17:57
        13
                     JUROR KASSIDY HARRIS: No, I did not.
11:17:58
       14
11:17:59
       15
                     MR. HILL: All right. What about next to you?
11:18:01
        16
            We'll go to Mr. Richardson.
                     JUROR RICHARDSON: No, I did not.
11:18:04
        17
11:18:06
       18
                     MR. HILL:
                               No -- one way or the other?
       19
11:18:06
                     JUROR RICHARDSON:
                                       No, sir.
11:18:06
       20
                    MR. HILL: No --
11:18:06
       21
                     JUROR RICHARDSON: Never had any dealings with
       22
11:18:06
            patents.
11:18:07
       23
                     MR. HILL: All right. And then here on the end,
11:18:08
       24
           No. 14, Ms. Pate?
11:18:13 25
                    JUROR PATE: No, sir, no feelings.
```

```
11:18:15
                    MR. HILL: All right. One of the defenses that
         1
            the jury in this case is going to hear about and will
11:18:17
            decide is whether USAA's patents are invalid, okay? That's
11:18:19
            one of the issues that are going to exist in this case.
11:18:25
            And a finding of invalidity means that you will be
11:18:27
11:18:31
            canceling the patent USAA claims in this case.
        7
                    Now, those are patents that were issued by the
11:18:34
            Patent Office, and I'll -- I've done this a number of times
11:18:38
11:18:41
            over the years. A lot of folks don't feel comfortable with
            that role, okay? A lot of people think, I'm going to serve
11:18:43
        10
11:18:46
            on a jury, and I'm going to be asked to cancel a patent
        11
        12
            that the Patent Office issued, I don't so much know about
11:18:53
            that.
11:18:57
        13
                    And so what I'm asking is, is there anybody out
11:18:57
        14
11:19:00
       15
            there that feels like a jury shouldn't be the one asked to
            invalidate a patent? Anybody feel that way? Anybody feel
11:19:03
       16
            uncomfortable knowing you're going to sit on a case where
11:19:07
        17
            depending on what the evidence shows, you may be in a
11:19:10
       18
11:19:13
       19
            position where you have to invalidate a patent? Does that
11:19:18
        20
            cause anybody discomfort?
        21
                    Let's ask Mr. -- Mr. Nilsson.
11:19:19
11:19:23
       22
                    JUROR NILSSON: My question -- I actually had a
11:19:24
       23
            question because what --
11:19:24
       24
                    MR. HILL: Okay.
11:19:25 25
                    JUROR NILSSON: -- what you're saying is, at the
```

```
end of the day, so the decision made by the jury will not
11:19:26
         1
            only could -- it will invalidate a patent and then
11:19:31
            naturally any money that someone was seeking would be
11:19:36
11:19:40
            negated, as well?
         4
                     MR. HILL: That's right.
11:19:42
         5
                    JUROR NILSSON: That is what you're -- that's what
11:19:44
         6
            you're saying?
11:19:44
        7
11:19:44
         8
                     MR. HILL: Yes, sir.
11:19:44
                     JUROR NILSSON: Okay. Just so we're clear.
         9
                     MR. HILL: If the patent is invalid -- if the
11:19:45
       10
            patent is invalid, then USAA can't use that invalid patent
11:19:46
        11
11:19:49
        12
            to demand money damages --
11:19:49
       13
                     JUROR NILSSON: Understood.
                    MR. HILL: -- from a company like Wells Fargo.
11:19:51
       14
                    JUROR NILSSON: That makes it clear for all of us.
11:19:52
       15
                     MR. HILL: All right. Is there anybody who thinks
11:19:55
       16
            to themselves -- and, Mr. Nilsson, I'll start with you
11:19:58
       17
            since we were talking about it -- who thinks, you know, if
11:20:01
       18
            the -- if the evidence supported it, I might still have a
11:20:03
       19
11:20:09
       20
            little hesitancy about invalidating a patent?
       21
11:20:12
                     JUROR NILSSON: I -- I'm not educated enough to
11:20:15
       22
            make that decision yet. I need to have some more
11:20:18 23
            information because I'm just not -- we're not there yet for
11:20:21
       24
            me to be able to answer the question.
11:20:25 25
                     MR. HILL: Yes, sir.
```

```
11:20:25
                     JUROR NILSSON: I don't have all the facts.
         1
11:20:26
                    MR. HILL: A lot of people think -- you know, they
         2
            think, well, you know, that may be the law, but I couldn't
11:20:28
            take away a patent issued by the Patent Office. Do you
11:20:29
            feel that way?
11:20:32
         5
11:20:33
                     JUROR NILSSON: I'm -- I'm just not ready to
            make -- I just -- I can't answer it honestly because I
11:20:35
        7
11:20:37
            don't know. I'm going to want to know more of the rules
            and how all that stuff works.
11:20:41
                     MR. HILL: Yes, sir. And -- and once you learn
11:20:42
        10
11:20:43
            those rules and hear those rules, if the Judge tells you
        11
            that those are the rules and that's what you'll be asked to
11:20:47
        12
11:20:49
        13
            do, do you believe you'd be able to consider the evidence
            and decide that question and invalidate a patent if you
11:20:49
       14
11:20:53
       15
            needed to?
                     JUROR NILSSON: If it's wrong, it's wrong; if it's
11:20:53
       16
            right, it's right.
11:20:55
       17
11:20:56
       18
                    MR. HILL: All right. Let me go down the row
11:21:00
       19
            here. Mr. -- Mr. Meade next to you.
11:21:02
       20
                    Mr. Meade, how do you feel about that?
                     JUROR MEADE: I'm kind of one of the ones that --
11:21:02
        21
       22
            you know, it's not going to sway me either way. If it's --
11:21:05
11:21:07
        23
            the findings go that it needs to be invalidated or
11:21:11
        24
            validated, either way. In some ways, I kind of look at --
            maybe it's a Patent Office issue that shouldn't be a jury.
11:21:13 25
```

```
11:21:16
                    MR. HILL: Uh-huh.
         1
11:21:17
                    JUROR MEADE: But that's kind of dealing with
         2
            things at work. Usually, if it's your fight, then deal
11:21:19
            with the people that should be dealing with it, not
11:21:23
            necessarily anybody else. But that's -- that's kind of
11:21:26
         5
11:21:29
            just a -- the way my business goes. That's the way it's
            kind of dealt with. If it's your problem, you deal with it
11:21:31
        7
            with the people that it's circled around.
11:21:36
                    MR. HILL: Well, if the -- if the Judge instructs
11:21:36
       10
            you on the law in this case and says that's an issue the
11:21:38
11:21:42
            jury has to decide, that's the jury's role --
        11
                    JUROR MEADE: Uh-huh.
11:21:42
       12
11:21:43 13
                    MR. HILL: -- would you be able to perform that
11:21:45 14
           role?
11:21:45
       15
                    JUROR MEADE: Yes, sir.
                    MR. HILL: All right. Is there anybody that would
11:21:47
       16
            have pause, who would think, Mr. Hill, that may be the law,
11:21:48
       17
            but I -- even if the evidence is there, I don't know if I
       18
11:21:51
11:21:55
       19
            could invalidate a patent.
       20
11:21:58
                    Let me start on the back row, folks I haven't
            talked to here -- No. 10 here, if I can. That's
11:22:01
        21
11:22:05
       22
            Ms. Walker.
11:22:06 23
                    Ms. Walker, how do you feel about that?
11:22:08 24
                    JUROR WALKER: I feel that if evidence presented
           the fact that it was not valid, then I could rule it not
11:22:10 25
```

```
1 valid.
11:22:15
11:22:16
                    MR. HILL: Okay. And then No. 9 right next to you
         2
           there. Again, Ms. Manning?
11:22:19
        3
                    JUROR MANNING: Well, I feels the same way she
11:22:19
           just said.
11:22:23
        5
11:22:24
                    MR. HILL: Okay. And then No. 8 beside you there,
           Ms. McDonald?
        7
11:22:28
11:22:29
        8
                    JUROR MCDONALD: I feel the same way.
11:22:32
                    MR. HILL: All right.
        9
                    JUROR MCDONALD: Whatever the evidence.
11:22:32 10
                    MR. HILL: Is there anybody that disagrees with
11:22:33 11
11:22:35 12
           them?
                    Now, let me see the hands of everybody that gets a
11:22:39
       13
           property tax bill every year from the county appraiser.
11:22:42
       14
11:22:45
       15
            Doesn't bring a happy face when you raise that hand.
                    Now, let me -- let me just start -- let me see
11:22:48
       16
            those hands again. Let me see who all we've got. All
11:22:51
       17
            right. Let's -- let's start here on the -- No. 15, that's
11:22:55
       18
            Ms. -- Ms. Shepard?
11:22:59
       19
11:23:00 20
                    Ms. Shepard, let me ask you about that. Now, you
11:23:05
       21
            get that property tax appraisal every year, right? And the
11:23:08 22
            appraisal district has trained professional appraisers,
11:23:12 23
            right?
11:23:12 24
                    JUROR SHEPARD: Right.
11:23:14 25
                   MR. HILL: And it's their work for them to come up
```

```
with that new property value each year. Are those
11:23:16
        1
11:23:18
            appraisals always right?
         2
                    JUROR SHEPARD: In my mind, no.
11:23:20
         3
                    MR. HILL: Okay. Why not?
11:23:22
         4
                    JUROR SHEPARD: I just feel like it reflects an
11:23:24
         5
            amount that not always -- you know, we haven't always done
11:23:28
            improvements to our property and this and that, I don't
11:23:29
        7
11:23:32
            feel like. But I do pay my taxes so...
         8
                    MR. HILL: Yes, ma'am. We all have to --
11:23:33
            begrudgingly or not, we have to.
11:23:37
        10
                    JUROR SHEPARD: Right.
11:23:41
        11
       12
                    MR. HILL: Let me ask, is there anybody who
11:23:41
11:23:43
       13
            disagrees with Ms. Shepard and thinks, no, you know, the
            tax office, they get those appraisals right? Okay.
11:23:45
       14
                    They make -- mistakes can be made, correct?
11:23:50
       15
                    JUROR SHEPARD: Correct.
11:23:55 16
11:23:56
       17
                    MR. HILL: Have you ever had to challenge an
            appraisal?
11:23:59
       18
11:24:02
       19
                    JUROR SHEPARD: Not that I recall, no.
11:24:03 20
                    MR. HILL: Has anybody here ever challenged their
           tax appraisal?
11:24:06
       21
11:24:07
       22
                    All right. Let's see, No. 5 here, Ms. Fisher.
11:24:07 23
                    Thank you, Ms. Shepard.
11:24:13 24
                    Ms. Fisher, you've challenged a tax appraisal?
11:24:13 25
                    JUROR FISHER: Yes, sir.
```

```
MR. HILL: All right. Did you know that if you
11:24:14
         1
            take that far enough, you can even get a trial in court
11:24:15
         2
            over that property value?
11:24:19
         3
                    JUROR FISHER: I didn't. I was able to settle it.
11:24:20
         4
                    MR. HILL: All right. Very good. But why do we
11:24:22
         5
11:24:23
            have that process, Ms. Fisher?
                    JUROR FISHER: Well, to make sure that everything
        7
11:24:26
11:24:28
            is equal and -- and balanced.
        8
11:24:32
                    MR. HILL: All right. So it's a check and a
        9
            balance on the -- on the appraisal office because sometimes
11:24:34
        10
            when things are done the first time, government agencies
11:24:38
        11
            don't all get it right, do they?
11:24:41
        12
                    JUROR FISHER: That's correct.
11:24:42
        13
11:24:43
       14
                    MR. HILL: Anybody think government agencies are
            infallible?
11:24:47
        15
11:24:49
       16
                    Okay. Now, the Patent Office, Ms. Fisher, let
            me -- let me just ask you a question about this. The
11:24:51
        17
            Patent Office is a federal government agency, like the IRS,
11:24:53
       18
            like the VA, or other federal government agencies. Have
11:24:57
       19
11:25:02
       20
            you ever had any dealings with a federal government agency?
                     JUROR FISHER: I've worked for the federal
11:25:03
       21
11:25:05 22
            government.
11:25:05 23
                    MR. HILL: Okay. Who did you work for?
11:25:06 24
                    JUROR FISHER: It was an ammunition plant.
11:25:09 25
                   MR. HILL: Was it Red River up in --
```

```
11:25:11
         1
                     JUROR FISHER: No, it was Thiokol -- or Longhorn
           Army Ammunition Plant.
11:25:15
         2
                    MR. HILL: I got you. I got you.
11:25:17
         3
                    You mentioned also earlier, Ms. Fisher, while I've
11:25:18
         4
            got you there, that your stepson had gotten a patent on
11:25:21
        5
            something?
11:25:24
        6
        7
                    JUROR FISHER: Correct.
11:25:24
                    MR. HILL: All right. Is that going to influence
11:25:25
         8
            you, you think, in hearing a case where you may be asked to
11:25:26
       9
11:25:30
       10
            invalidate a patent?
11:25:31
        11
                    JUROR FISHER: It won't, because I don't know
11:25:32 12
           about them.
11:25:32
       13
                    MR. HILL: Okay.
                    THE COURT: You have five minutes remaining,
11:25:32
       14
11:25:35 15
           counsel.
11:25:35
       16
                    MR. HILL: Thank you, Your Honor.
                    Well, folks, what you're going to see today, those
11:25:35
       17
            of you that hear this case, is that the Patent Office also
11:25:50
       18
11:25:53
       19
            has a check and a balance. Our patent laws set up a check
11:25:57
       20
            and a balance for the Patent Office. That check and
            balance is actually this. It's you. It's a jury trial.
11:25:59
       21
11:26:03
       22
                    And what we're going to be presenting to the jury
11:26:07 23
            is asking that that check-and-balance process be used to
11:26:12 24
            look at the work that the Patent Office has done in this
11:26:15 25
            case.
```

```
So I want to ask one last time before I move on,
11:26:15
         1
11:26:23
           anybody going to have a problem, going to have an issue,
         2
            going to have reservations if they're on a jury where
11:26:23
            they're asked to exercise as to be that check valve that
11:26:27
            exists?
11:26:29
        5
                    Thank you, folks.
11:26:31
        6
        7
                    Now, one other thing you heard in this case is the
11:26:32
           presumption of validity. You heard mentioned earlier,
11:26:36
11:26:39
            Judge -- and you heard it in the video earlier about there
            is a presumption of validity about a patent. And that's
11:26:45 10
11:26:47
       11
           true.
11:26:48 12
                    But let me talk to you about that. Let me see the
           hands of those of you who have served on a criminal case
11:26:51
       13
11:26:51 14
           before. All right.
11:26:56 15
                    No. 4 here, Mr. Johns. Now, there a presumption
           in a criminal case, too, right?
11:26:58 16
       17
                    JUROR JOHNS: Yes, sir.
11:27:00
                    MR. HILL: Presumption of innocence. What did you
11:27:00
       18
           find in your case?
11:27:04
       19
11:27:05 20
                    JUROR JOHNS: My presumption of it?
                    MR. HILL: Well, did y'all find the person quilty
11:27:07 21
11:27:09 22 or innocent?
11:27:11 23
                    JUROR JOHNS: They were guilty.
11:27:12 24
                    MR. HILL: All right. So that presumption didn't
11:27:14 25 preclude you from reaching a verdict, did it?
```

```
11:27:17
         1
                     JUROR JOHNS: No, sir.
11:27:17
                    MR. HILL: Why not?
         2
                    JUROR JOHNS: Because it was the right -- it was
11:27:18
         3
            right. I mean, evidence was there beyond a reasonable
11:27:19
            doubt.
11:27:20
         5
11:27:20
                     MR. HILL: It was because the evidence was there,
         6
            right?
        7
11:27:21
11:27:21
        8
                    JUROR JOHNS: Yes, sir.
                    MR. HILL: So if there's evidence, the presumption
11:27:22
        9
11:27:25
        10
            goes away and you follow what the evidence requires; is
11:27:29
        11
            that right?
       12
11:27:29
                     JUROR JOHNS: Yes, sir.
                     THE COURT: Mr. Johns, hold that microphone
11:27:29 13
           closer.
11:27:32
       14
11:27:32
       15
                    JUROR JOHNS: Yes, sir.
                     MR. HILL: Thank you, sir. I appreciate it.
11:27:34
       16
                     THE COURT: Hold it closer next time.
11:27:35
       17
                     MR. HILL: Now, one of the things you're going to
11:27:38
       18
11:27:40
       19
            hear addressed in this case is damages. As you heard
       20
11:27:44
            earlier, USAA is going to ask for over a hundred million
11:27:47
       21
            dollars in damages.
       22
                     And I have heard jurors say to me before after a
11:27:48
11:27:53
       23
            case, well, the Defendant in the case talked about why the
11:27:56
       24
            damages were wrong and why the damages should be lower, so
11:28:00 25
            they obviously thought they owed something.
```

Anybody think about it that way? Think that if a 11:28:05 1 11:28:10 Defendant mentions damages, that they must think they owe 2 something? 11:28:13 3 No? 11:28:14 As you heard the Judge describe earlier, my job as 11:28:18 5 11:28:22 a lawyer, I'm legally required to rebut the case the Plaintiff puts on, and so I can't just say, huh-uh. I have 7 11:28:25 to put on evidence to rebut it. And so part of our role 11:28:28 8 11:28:32 will be to put on damages evidence also. And my question is, is anybody on the jury going to look at our 11:28:35 10 11:28:39 presentation of damages evidence and think, oh, they're 11 admitting something? 11:28:42 12 Mr. Nilsson, would you feel that way? 11:28:43 13 JUROR NILSSON: Not necessarily, no -- I'm sorry. 11:28:45 14 11:28:48 15 MR. HILL: Do you understand that that's our task as the defense side of a case is to put on the contrary 11:28:50 view? 11:28:52 17 JUROR NILSSON: As much as it is their side of the 11:28:53 18 11:28:55 19 case to present their side. 11:28:57 20 MR. HILL: Yes, sir. Thank you, sir. Now, ladies and gentlemen, I'll point out to you 11:28:58 21 22 what's gone on here this morning, I had to go second, 11:29:06 11:29:07 23 that's going to go on through the whole case. They get to 11:29:09 24 go first as the Plaintiff. We have to go second. Have any 11:29:12 25 of you that have small children ever had one come tattling

to you about what the other was doing? Do you take what 11:29:16 1 11:29:19 the first one tells you as the gospel? No? Does it always turn out that the story you get from the first one is 11:29:26 really what happened? Anybody think that? 11:29:29 Can I get a commitment from all of you that you 11:29:33 5 11:29:36 will wait and hear both sides of the story, wait and hear from us before you make your mind up? Because it is our 7 11:29:41 belief that when you hear the whole story, you'll have a 11:29:45 11:29:48 different view of it. And I want to just ask down the row here, 11:29:49 10 11:29:52 Mr. Bouzek, starting with you, can I get that commitment 11 11:29:55 12 from you. 11:29:55 13 JUROR BOUZEK: Uh-huh. MR. HILL: Can I get that commitment from 11:29:58 14 11:30:00 15 everybody on the first row? Can I get that commitment from everybody on the back row? What about over here, can I get 11:30:04 16 11:30:06 that commitment from everybody over on this side of the 17 room? Is there anybody that tells me, I don't know if I 11:30:10 18 can give you that commitment? 11:30:13 19 11:30:15 20 Now, ladies and gentlemen, I will end much like Mr. Bunt did. Lawyers can't --11:30:18 21 11:30:22 22 THE COURT: Your time is expired. 11:30:23 23 MR. HILL: Well, I will end quicker than Mr. Bunt 11:30:26 24 did. 11:30:27 25 Thank you, Your Honor, I appreciate the time.

```
11:30:29
         1
                     THE COURT: Thank you.
11:30:30
                    All right. Counsel, approach the bench, please.
         2
                    (Bench conference.)
11:30:46
         3
                    THE COURT: Does the Plaintiff have any challenges
11:30:50
         4
            for cause, Mr. Bunt?
11:30:55
         5
11:30:56
                    MR. BUNT: Yes, Your Honor, No. 16.
         6
         7
                    THE COURT: All right. Any others?
11:31:02
                    MR. BUNT: No, Your Honor.
11:31:06
         8
                    THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Hill, does Defendant have
11:31:08
            any challenges for cause?
11:31:10
        10
11:31:12
        11
                    MR. HILL: Yes, Your Honor, we have four: No. 6,
            No. 19, No. 22, and No. 26. And let me explain my issue
11:31:16
       12
            there, Your Honor. So these individuals are all members of
11:31:26
       13
            USAA. They or their spouse are a member of USAA, which
11:31:30
       14
11:31:35
       15
            means that they have a direct financial interest in the
            outcome of the litigation.
11:31:37
       16
                    USAA, because of the nature of its ownership,
11:31:39
       17
            returns dividends based on financial performance of the
11:31:42
       18
11:31:45
       19
            company to its members. It is akin to stock ownership. It
11:31:48
       20
            is a legal disqualification from jury service, Your Honor.
        21
            I have cases and case cites I can give you on the matter.
11:31:51
11:31:56
       22
            And I don't have them on hand here, but I've got them at
11:31:59
       23
            the table, Your Honor. But a USAA member is akin to stock
11:32:04
       24
            ownership.
11:32:07 25
                   MR. SHEASBY: Your Honor, I can confirm that his
```

```
case law citations are correct.
11:32:08
         1
11:32:11
                     THE COURT: So you're agreeing, Mr. Sheasby, that
         2
            if these four venire members identified by Mr. Bunt are, in
11:32:13
         3
            fact, members of USAA, that they should be disqualified?
11:32:18
                     MR. SHEASBY: Yes, and Mr. Hill is correct, Your
11:32:22
         5
11:32:25
            Honor.
         6
        7
                    MR. HILL: And we have no -- no opposition to
11:32:25
            No. 16 to -- cause challenge by the Plaintiff, Your Honor.
11:32:32
11:32:35
                     THE COURT: Is there any factual dispute among the
        9
            parties as to the four venire members identified by
11:32:37
        10
11:32:41
        11
            Mr. Hill as being actual members of USAA? Do I need to
11:32:44
        12
            call them up here and verify that?
                     MR. HILL: I don't know that we do, Your Honor.
11:32:47
        13
            We've heard from them both in open venire, and we've seen
11:32:48
       14
            the answers in the questionnaires. They indicated these
11:32:53
       15
            answers in the questionnaires.
11:32:59
       16
                     MR. SHEASBY: I think we should ask 22 and 26
11:33:05
       17
11:33:08
       18
            quickly, Your Honor.
                     THE COURT: All right. Well, with no opposition
11:33:08
       19
11:33:13
       20
            from the Defendants to Plaintiff's challenge for cause as
            to Ms. Hilgenfeld, No. 16, I'm going to excuse No. 16.
11:33:18
        21
11:33:22
        22
                     If there's any doubt, I'll bring up 22 and 26 and
11:33:28
       23
            confirm their membership in USAA.
11:33:30
       24
                     MR. SHEASBY: We would request -- we would
11:33:34 25
            appreciate that, Your Honor.
```

11:33:35 1 THE COURT: There are obviously no scheduling issues with any members of the panel. Are there any other 11:33:37 2 members of the panel that I should hold back, other than 22 11:33:40 3 and 26, to question here about their membership in USAA? 11:33:43 MR. SHEASBY: Nothing from Plaintiffs, Your Honor. 11:33:47 5 THE COURT: Defendant? 11:33:49 6 7 MR. HILL: No, sir -- no, sir, Your Honor. 11:33:50 11:33:51 THE COURT: All right. Take a seat, counsel. 8 MR. SHEASBY: Thank you, Your Honor. 11:33:53 9 (Bench conference concluded.) 11:33:54 10 THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, I'm about to 11:33:58 11 excuse you for a recess, except there are two of you I'm 11:34:00 12 11:34:04 13 going to ask to stay behind and let me talk with you here briefly at the bench, but everyone else I'm going to excuse 11:34:07 14 11:34:10 15 for recess. Those of you who are part of that larger group 11:34:11 16 that's going to be excused for recess, if you will exit 11:34:14 17 through the double doors in the back and stay inside the 11:34:17 18 11:34:20 19 building. Don't leave the building. Also, as you go on to 11:34:25 20 the recess, if you make a left going out of those double doors, you'll find two important things, the restrooms and 11:34:28 21 22 the water fountains. 11:34:34 11:34:34 23 It's also important, ladies and gentlemen, that 11:34:36 24 those of you that are on recess, that you not talk about anything that's happened in the courtroom today. Talk 11:34:39 25

```
about the weather, talk about what's left of the football
11:34:41
        1
            season, talk about anything you'd like to, but don't
11:34:45
            discuss anything that's happened in here this morning.
11:34:48
         3
                    Let me remind every one of you, you have not heard
11:34:50
            any evidence in this case at all at this point. So don't
11:34:53
11:34:58
            discuss anything that's happened in the courtroom this
            morning.
11:34:59
        7
                     I'm going to ask everyone to recess in just a
11:35:00
         8
            minute except Panel Member No. 22, Mr. Neeley, and 26,
11:35:07
            Ms. Black.
11:35:14
       10
                     Everyone else, if you will exit at this time, if
11:35:15
       11
            those two will just remain in their seats, all but 22
11:35:19
       12
            and -- just leave your cards in your chairs. All about 22
11:35:24
       13
            and 26 are excused for recess at this time. If you'll lead
11:35:28
       14
11:35:32
       15
            the way, Mr. Nilsson.
                     (Venire panel out.)
11:35:57
       16
                     THE COURT: Be seated, please.
11:36:03
       17
11:36:18
       18
                     Counsel, approach the bench.
                     And, Mr. Neeley, would you please come up and join
11:36:34
       19
11:36:39 20
            us, please, sir?
11:36:41
        21
                     JUROR NEELEY: Yes, sir.
11:36:50
       22
                     (Bench conference.)
11:36:52 23
                     JUROR NEELEY: Yes, sir.
11:36:52 24
                     THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Neeley.
11:36:54 25
                     JUROR NEELEY: Good morning, how are you?
```

```
THE COURT: One guick guestion. You are or are
11:36:56
         1
11:36:59
         2 not a member of USAA?
                    JUROR NEELEY: My wife is. I'm not.
11:37:01
         3
11:37:02
        4
                    THE COURT: Okay.
                    JUROR NEELEY: We used to have insurance through
11:37:03
         5
11:37:05
           them.
11:37:05 7
                    THE COURT: How -- what -- what kind of
            insurance does your wife have through USAA?
11:37:07
        8
                    JUROR NEELEY: She has a bank account now. We
11:37:09
           used to have our homeowner's insurance and all that through
11:37:11
       10
11:37:14 11
          them.
11:37:15 12
                    THE COURT: Yes, sir.
                    JUROR NEELEY: And we -- we switched insurance
11:37:16 13
11:37:17  14 | because the insurance rates, but we kept -- she kept the
11:37:21 15 | bank account.
                    THE COURT: So you don't have any insurance with
11:37:21 16
11:37:26  17 | them at this time?
                    JUROR NEELEY: No, sir.
11:37:27 18
                    THE COURT: Do you have a bank account?
11:37:27 19
11:37:27 20
                    JUROR NEELEY: Yes.
11:37:28 21
                    THE COURT: Are you on that bank account?
11:37:30 22
                    JUROR NEELEY: I don't think so. I don't know.
11:37:31 23 | She handles all that stuff. I'm just the money maker.
11:37:37 24
                    THE COURT: Okay. All right.
11:37:38 25
                    Mr. Hill, do you have any questions of Mr. Neeley?
```

```
MR. HILL: Mr. Neeley, on the insurance policy,
11:37:41
         1
           those were your -- your home and your property y'all
11:37:43
         2
            jointly own?
11:37:46
        3
11:37:47
                    JUROR NEELEY: Yes, sir.
                    MR. HILL: Did you have any other insurance with
11:37:48
         5
            them?
11:37:50
        6
        7
                    JUROR NEELEY: No, sir.
11:37:50
                    MR. HILL: Car insurance?
11:37:51
         8
                    JUROR NEELEY: We had car insurance, I believe --
11:37:52
        9
11:37:55
       10
            car insurance, our side-by-side was insured with them, our
            house was insured with them, but we switched to Hochheim.
11:38:00
       11
                    MR. HILL: Okay. And the bank account you still
11:38:07 12
11:38:10 13
           have --
11:38:11 14
                    JUROR NEELEY: Yes, sir.
11:38:12 15
                    MR. HILL: And you know that the USAA membership
11:38:17 16
            extends to both the spouse -- to the military member, the
            former military member, and to their spouse?
11:38:18
       17
                    JUROR NEELEY: Correct.
11:38:22
       18
11:38:22 19
                    MR. HILL: And so you participated in those
11:38:24 20 policies, as well?
11:38:25 21
                    JUROR NEELEY: Well, yes, I guess -- because my
11:38:26 22
            wife got it through her dad because he was a Marine, and he
11:38:31 23
           had USAA.
11:38:31 24
                    THE COURT: How long has it been since you had any
           insurance with USAA, more than a year or two?
11:38:35 25
```

```
11:38:39
         1
                    JUROR NEELEY: Year.
11:38:41
                    MR. BUNT: Do you know if you were seeking
         2
            dividends from USAA?
11:38:44
        3
                    JUROR NEELEY: If I do, I don't know about it.
11:38:46
         4
                    MR. BUNT: Thank you, sir.
11:38:48
         5
11:38:49
                    THE COURT: If I were to call USAA in San Antonio
         6
            and say, is Mr. Chad Neeley a member of USAA, do you know
11:38:57
11:39:02
            what they'd tell me?
        8
11:39:04
                    JUROR NEELEY: I honestly wouldn't know what
11:39:06
       10
           they'd tell you.
       11
                    THE COURT: Okay. All right. Mr. Neeley, anybody
11:39:07
11:39:09 12
            else got any other questions?
11:39:11
       13
                    MR. HILL: No, sir.
11:39:11 14
                    MR. BUNT: No, sir.
11:39:13 15
                    THE COURT: Mr. Neeley, I'm going to let you join
            the rest of the members outside. Just don't discuss
11:39:15 16
            anything we've talked about in here.
11:39:18
       17
11:39:20
       18
                    JUROR NEELEY: Okay. Thank you.
                    (Juror exits courtroom.)
11:39:20 19
11:39:25 20
                    (Bench conference continued.)
11:39:25 21
                    MR. SHEASBY: Your Honor, he actually does not
       22 | sound like a member.
11:39:27
                    THE COURT: Let me ask this, counsel, and I'll ask
11:39:28
       23
11:39:30 24
           this specifically to Mr. Hill: If the participation by
            someone like Mr. Neeley or his wife is unrelated to their
11:39:34 25
```

insurance where they make a profit and share dividends with 11:39:39 1 members but it's only related to their banking function, is 11:39:44 it your position that they would potentially have a 11:39:49 3 pecuniary benefit --11:39:53 MR. HILL: Yes, Your Honor. 11:39:54 5 11:39:55 THE COURT: -- only through the banking? 6 7 MR. HILL: Yes, Your Honor, it would be. 11:39:58 The membership interest and the way it works once they have 11:39:59 8 the membership interest and the actual dividend payment, it 11:40:02 can also extend to banking customers. And so --11:40:05 10 11:40:07 11 THE COURT: So they participate in any benefit no matter what their level of actual coverage or interaction 11:40:09 12 11:40:12 13 with USAA is, as long as they're designated as a member? MR. HILL: I don't know that I can say it that 11:40:16 14 11:40:18 15 broadly, Your Honor, but I do know that since her membership level was such that she bought insurance and 11:40:21 16 banking, the discovery we've taken in the case and the 11:40:25 17 research we've done indicates to us that they still would 11:40:28 18 have a continuing pecuniary interest and still would be --11:40:31 19 11:40:35 20 and there would still be a legal basis for a challenge for 11:40:36 21 cause. 11:40:37 22 The fact that it's him -- or the wife and not him 11:40:40 23 doesn't, under our view of the case law, change that 11:40:43 24 either, Your Honor, because it's still a familial direct 11:40:45 25 benefit.

```
THE COURT: I understand. Let me get Ms. Black up
11:40:46
         1
11:40:48
         2 here.
                    (Open court.)
11:40:48
         3
                    THE COURT: Ms. Black, would you join us, please?
11:40:48
         4
                    (Bench conference continued.)
11:41:09
         5
11:41:09
                    THE COURT: Good morning.
        6
11:41:10 7
                    JUROR BLACK: Good morning.
                    THE COURT: These are our microphones. We're just
11:41:11
        8
            going to talk quietly. I just really have one question.
11:41:12
       9
           Are you a member of USAA?
11:41:13 10
11:41:14
       11
                    JUROR BLACK: Yes.
                    THE COURT: Okay. That's all I need to know.
11:41:15 12
11:41:17 13
                    JUROR BLACK: Okay.
                    THE COURT: Can you join of the rest of the group
11:41:17 14
11:41:20 15 outside. Just don't discuss what we talked about in here.
11:41:23 16
                    JUROR BLACK: Thank you.
                    (Juror exits courtroom.)
11:41:23 17
                    (Bench conference continued.)
11:41:24 18
                    THE COURT: All right. That leaves us unresolved
11:41:24 19
11:41:31 20 | strictly Mr. Neeley.
11:41:33 21
                    Counsel, I can take -- I can take briefing from
11:41:37 22 | both sides or I can excuse Mr. Neeley. He's at No. 22.
11:41:42 23 | Let's see if we're going to reach him under any
11:41:46 24
          circumstance.
11:41:49 25
                 No. 6 will go. No. 16 will go. And No. 19 will
```

```
11:41:52
        1
           go.
11:41:52
                    MR. SHEASBY: Your Honor, I'm going to make this
           easy. I don't want to --
11:41:53
        3
                    THE COURT: I don't think we're going to reach him
11:41:55
11:41:58
        5
           anyway.
11:41:58
                    MR. SHEASBY: Okay. So, yeah.
        6
        7
                    THE COURT: All right. Well, I'm going to -- just
11:41:59
            for clarity in the record, counsel, I'm going to excuse
11:42:03
11:42:06
            Ms. Hilgenfeld for cause. I'm excusing Mr. Meade for
            cause. I'm going to excuse Mr. Pickens for cause, No. 19.
11:42:13
       10
           And Ms. Black, No. 26, for cause.
11:42:17
        11
11:42:23
       12
                    It does not appear -- with seating eight jurors
            and each side having four strikes, it looks like we're
11:42:26
       13
           going to strike through No. -- is it 20?
11:42:35
       14
                    MR. HILL: I think it's 18, Judge.
11:42:40
       15
                    THE COURT: 18? It's one side or the other of 19.
11:42:41
       16
                    MR. HILL: 16 -- 16 to burn, and then we got two
11:42:43
       17
           within the zone, that would be -- that's 18 total. I
11:42:45
       18
           believe 18 would be the end of the strike zone.
11:42:49
       19
11:42:52
       20
                    MR. BUNT: Your Honor, just so I'm clear, is it
            Jurors No. 6 and No. 16 who are out?
11:42:55
       21
11:42:59 22
                    THE COURT: No. 16 is out, and No. 6 is excused,
11:43:03 23 yes.
11:43:03 24
                    MR. SHEASBY: And 19.
11:43:04 25
                    THE COURT: And 19 and 26, but striking from the
```

```
beginning of the panel, I don't think -- I think Mr. Hill
11:43:07
         1
            is correct, we should strike -- you should strike through
11:43:11
            No. 18. So it's irrelevant whether Mr. Neeley is going to
11:43:15
            be struck or not because he's never going to be reached.
11:43:20
                     MR. SHEASBY: Yes, understood.
11:43:23
         5
                     THE COURT: So I'll --
11:43:24
         6
         7
                    MR. SHEASBY: So I didn't need to be that generous
11:43:30
            that quick.
11:43:33
         8
                     THE COURT: I don't -- I don't think I need a -- I
11:43:34
            don't think I need to rule on whether Mr. Neeley is going
11:43:37
        10
            to be struck for cause or not because he's never going to
11:43:40
        11
11:43:42
       12
            be reached.
11:43:43
       13
                     MR. SHEASBY: I agree, Your Honor.
                     MR. HILL: I agree, Your Honor, unless he -- we
11:43:43
       14
11:43:45
        15
            will maintain our challenge, but if some act of God happens
            and we see he's going to be reached, we want our challenge
11:43:45
        16
            for the record.
11:43:51
        17
                     THE COURT: If he's going to be -- if he's going
        18
11:43:51
            to be reached, then I'll re-raise the issue with counsel
11:43:52
        19
        20
11:43:57
            outside of the jury's presence before the jury is seated.
11:44:00
        21
                     MR. HILL: Thank you, sir.
11:44:01
        22
                     MR. SHEASBY: Thank you, Your Honor.
11:44:02
       23
                     THE COURT: All right. Counsel, it's about 17
11:44:04
       24
            minutes until noon. Why don't you have your jury lists
            struck and back to Ms. Lockhart by noon, okay?
11:44:08 25
```

```
MR. SHEASBY: Thank you, Your Honor.
11:44:13
         1
                     MR. HILL: Thank you, Your Honor.
11:44:13
         2
                     MR. BUNT: May we use -- one of us use the jury
11:44:14
         3
            room, and we've already asked Judge Payne and he said we
11:44:16
         4
            could use his jury room.
11:44:19
         5
                     THE COURT: I know of no reason why you can't.
11:44:22
         6
         7
11:44:24
                     MR. BUNT: Thank you, Judge.
11:44:24
         8
                     MR. MELSHEIMER: Thank you, Judge.
                     (Bench conference concluded.)
11:44:27
         9
                     THE COURT: All right. While counsel exercise
11:44:27
       10
            their peremptory challenges, the Court will stand in
11:44:29
       11
11:44:33 12
            recess.
11:44:34
       13
                    COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.
11:44:35 14
                     (Recess.)
12:13:36 15
                     (Venire panel in.)
                     COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.
12:13:36 16
                     THE COURT: Be seated, please.
12:13:38
       17
       18
                     All right. Ladies and gentlemen, if you will
12:13:49
            listen carefully as your name is called, if you'll come
12:13:51
       19
12:13:54
       20
            forward and take your seat in the jury box.
12:13:57
       21
                     Let me give you a little bit of instruction before
       22
            we do that, however. We're going to seat eight individuals
12:13:59
12:14:05
       23
            as the jury in this case. We have a lot more than eight
12:14:09
       24
            seats in the jury box.
12:14:10 25
                     So, consequently, I'm going to ask that the first
```

four people whose names are called come forward and place 12:14:15 1 12:14:19 themselves on the front row and the second four people, five, six, seven, and eight, when your name is called, come 12:14:22 3 forward and go to the second row in the jury box. 12:14:27 I'm going to ask the first person who's called 12:14:29 5 12:14:32 when you enter the front row of the jury box, to walk down and stand in front of the third chair from the end. Leave 12:14:36 7 two vacant chairs past you. That will put those four in 12:14:39 12:14:43 the middle of the front row. And when Jurors 5, 6, 7, and 8 come to the second 12:14:45 10 row of the jury box, if you will just line up behind your 12:14:50 11 counterpart on the front row, that will put our eight 12:14:55 12 jurors in the center of the jury box, four on the front row 12:14:57 13 and four on the second row. And if all of you will stand 12:15:01 14 15 12:15:04 until everyone is in the jury box and I instruct you further, that would be the Court's preference. 12:15:07 16 So with that, I'm going to ask our courtroom 12:15:09 17 deputy, Ms. Lockhart, to call the eight members of our 12:15:11 18 12:15:18 19 jury. 20 12:15:19 COURTROOM DEPUTY: Cheryl Jones, Gayla Harris, Travis Johns, Karen McDonald, Rose Manning, Lara Pate, 12:15:30 21 12:15:52 22 Christie Shepard, and Tracey Brown. 12:15:57 23 THE COURT: Thank you. Please have a seat.

Those of you that were not selected to serve on this jury, I'm about to excuse you at this time, but before

12:16:18

12:16:23 25

24

I do, I want to mention a couple of things.

First of all, if you need any documentation for an employer about where you've been this morning, any questions you have, see Ms. Clendening and the staff in the clerk's office out front. They will assist you in anything that you need. They're going to want to recover those very valuable laminated numbers that you're wearing and those juror pins. All of that will be picked up by the clerk's office. So see them on the way out, if you will.

If you have any questions or need any -- anything about where you've been this morning, they'll be glad to help you with that.

Also, ladies and gentlemen, the Court recognizes full well that every one of you, even though you weren't selected to serve on this jury, every one of you had other places to be today, you had other things to do that were important in your respective lives, and you set that aside, and you sacrificed those personal matters to be here and present yourself for service on this jury.

And even though you weren't selected, ladies and gentlemen, you have done very real and important public service by being here. You have answered the call to jury duty. Even though you weren't selected, you've done what every good citizen should do.

And, quite honestly, without ordinary citizens

12:16:26 1 12:16:28 2 12:16:31 3 12:16:34 12:16:37 5 12:16:40 12:16:44 7 12:16:48 8 12:16:53 9 12:16:57 10

12:17:01 13 12:17:04 14 12:17:07 15

12:16:58

12:16:58

12:17:10

11

12

16

20

24

12:17:13 17 12:17:17 18

12:17:22 19

12:17:24

12:17:26 21 12:17:29 22 12:17:33 23

12:17:38 25

12:17:36

```
such as yourselves coming forward and summonsed and being
12:17:40
         1
            present for this process that we went through this morning,
12:17:45
            the Court could not function as we're required to under the
12:17:46
         3
12:17:49
            Constitution. You've done very real, important public
            service by being here, and the Court thanks you for that.
12:17:55
         5
                     The Court recognizes it, and I'm confident that
12:17:57
         6
        7
            counsel for the parties, the Court staff, everyone on this
12:18:00
            side of the courtroom recognizes and appreciates that. And
12:18:02
            we -- we want you to know that we're thankful for your
12:18:06
       10
            service, even though you weren't selected to serve on this
12:18:10
12:18:14
        11
            jury.
                     Again, if you have any questions or need anything
12:18:15
        12
            with regard to being here this morning, I'll direct you to
12:18:17
        13
            the clerk's office and Ms. Clendening. Other than that,
12:18:20
       14
12:18:22
        15
            ladies and gentlemen, with the sincere thanks for you being
            here, you are excused at this time.
12:18:25
        16
                     COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.
12:18:28
        17
                     (Unselected venire panel members out.)
12:18:29
       18
                     THE COURT: Please be seated.
12:19:05
       19
       20
12:19:05
                     All right. Members of the jury, I'm going to ask
            that you stand at this time and be sworn. I'll ask our
12:19:10
       21
        22
            courtroom deputy, Ms. Lockhart, to administer the oath to
12:19:14
12:19:18
       23
            you. Please stand.
12:19:19 24
                     (Jurors sworn.)
12:19:24 25
                    THE COURT: Please be seated.
```

Ladies and gentlemen, I'm going to excuse you for 12:19:35 1 lunch in just a few minutes, but there's some instructions 12:19:41 I need to give you at this time before I do that. 12:19:44 3 First of all, ladies and gentlemen, do not discuss 12:19:47 this case with anyone. That is a -- an essential and 12:19:51 foundational instruction, and it's so important, you're 12:19:57 going to hear me repeat that throughout the trial process. 12:20:00 7 12:20:05 As a matter of fact, probably every time you get 8 up out of those seats, you're going to hear me say before 12:20:06 you do, don't discuss the case with anyone. 12:20:09 10 12:20:12 And when I say don't discuss the case, I mean 11 don't communicate in any way in any form about this 12:20:14 12 12:20:20 13 process. It is absolutely essential that when all the evidence has been presented and you retire to the jury room 12:20:25 14 12:20:28 15 to deliberate on your verdict, which will be your unanimous answers to certain questions that I will send to you at 12:20:32 16 that time, it is essential that the only information you 12:20:35 17 have to draw upon in answering those questions in the 12:20:39 18 verdict form must have come from the evidence that's been 12:20:42 19 12:20:47 20 presented in this courtroom during this trial and nowhere else. 12:20:51 21 12:20:52 22 You must rely on only the sworn testimony of the witnesses who testified under oath and are subject to 12:20:55 23 12:21:00 24 cross-examination and the documents and other items that the Court has admitted into evidence. 12:21:02 25

That must be the sole universe of what you draw 12:21:07 1 12:21:10 upon to answer the questions in the verdict form. 2 Therefore, you must not communicate or discuss in any way 12:21:13 3 this case with anyone. Otherwise, there will be things 12:21:17 before you that go beyond the evidence presented in open 12:21:20 5 12:21:25 court. That's why this is so essential. 7 And I promise you, ladies and gentlemen, when you 12:21:28 get home this evening, unless you live alone, the first 12:21:31 12:21:35 thing you're going to hear when you walk through the door is, tell me what happened in federal court in Marshall 12:21:37 10 12:21:40 today. 11 You can't even start to answer that question. 12:21:41 12 12:21:45 Just simply and upfront say to whoever, the Judge was very 13 clear, I can't talk about anything until the case is over. 12:21:51 14 12:21:54 15 Then I'll be free to discuss it with you. But you must not communicate with anyone in any way about this case. 12:21:57 16 And as a part of that, any of you that are active 12:22:00 17 on any form of social media, whether it's Facebook or 12:22:02 18 12:22:07 19 Twitter or Instagram or any of the other variations that 12:22:10 20 are out there, you must not post or tweet or do anything 21 with regard to social media. That is communication. You 12:22:15 12:22:18 22 must not communicate with anyone about this case. 12:22:22 23 And that, ladies and gentlemen, goes to the eight 12:22:24 24 of you among yourselves. You are not permitted to talk 12:22:27 25 among yourselves about the evidence or the case until the

time that all the evidence has been heard and at the point that I instruct you to retire to the jury room and to deliberate on your verdict. At that point, but only at that point, things shift and -- between the eight of you, you go from not being able to discuss the case among yourselves to being required to discuss the case and the evidence among yourselves.

But until we get to that point, when I -- until I instruct you to retire to the jury room and to deliberate on your verdict, you must not communicate, even among the eight of yourselves, about anything involving the trial or the evidence in this case.

So at this point, my instruction to you is completely across the board, do not communicate with anyone in any way about this case, including the eight of yourselves.

Also, you should not attempt to do any -- do any research about anything involved in this case. You should not go online and try to look up the lawyers or the parties or the law firms or any of the products that you might hear about. You're not permitted to do any research of any kind in any way, whether it's online or otherwise.

And with that in mind, I'm going to ask that if you have a cell phone device with you, that you not bring it back into the courtroom. And if you have it with you

12:22:57 7 12:23:00 8 12:23:02 12:23:05 10 12:23:09

11

12

18

21

12:22:33

12:22:38

12:22:41

12:22:45

12:22:51

12:22:54

1

3

12:23:16 13 12:23:19 14 12:23:22 15

12:23:12

12:23:26 16 12:23:26 17

12:23:31

12:23:44

12:23:34 19 20 12:23:38

12:23:48 22

12:23:50 23

12:23:55 24 12:24:00 25

today, leave it on the table in the jury room. And when 12:24:03 1 12:24:07 you come back tomorrow, don't bring it at all. Either leave it in your car or leave it at home. But I do not 12:24:10 want you to be tempted with a smartphone that is a computer 12:24:13 you hold in your hand where you might be tempted to do any 12:24:18 12:24:22 research or let's Google this or let's look at that. I don't want you to have that temptation. 12:24:25 7 So if you have a smartphone, you're welcome to 12:24:27 8 leave it in the jury room for the remainder of today. 12:24:31 After today, don't bring it back inside the courthouse. 12:24:36 10 12:24:39 You can either leave it in your car, or if you have an 11 important email that you're expecting related to a business 12:24:42 12 12:24:46 13 matter, you'll have an opportunity during the day at breaks to go to your car and look at it if it's important, but 12:24:47 14 12:24:49 15 don't bring those handheld computers, those smartphones back into the courtroom at all after today. 12:24:53 16 17 Now, you're going to see the lawyers with those 12:24:55 kind of devices at their tables during the trial. Those 12:24:57 18 12:25:00 19 are tools that they are using to conduct this case. 12:25:03 20 They're permitted to do that. They're not permitted to allow them to interrupt or disrupt the trial, and they will 12:25:06 21 12:25:09 22 have them on silent. If that's not the case, then I'll 12:25:13 23 deal with it. But don't feel that you've been put upon 12:25:17 24 that they can have a cell phone in their hand and you can't. There are very different reasons why I want you to 12:25:20 25

12:25:23

12:25:25

12:25:26

12:25:30

12:25:34

12:25:38

12:25:41

12:25:45

12:25:49

12:25:52

12:25:56

12:25:57

12:25:59

12:26:01

12:26:05

12:26:10

12:26:12

12:26:17

12:26:20

12:26:24

12:26:27

12:26:27

12:26:27

12:26:40

12:26:40 25

2

3

4

5

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

leave them at home starting tomorrow, and they'll have them 1 available to them in the courtroom.

Also, ladies and gentlemen, I don't think it's going to happen in this case, but it's possible, and I want to bring it to your attention. It's within the realm of possibility that some third party over the course of this trial could attempt to contact you and to influence your vote and your decision in this case. I don't think that's likely, but I want you to understand there are no insignificant cases that get to trial in a United States District Court.

This is an important case to both of these parties. There's a lot on the line for both of these parties. And it is at least within the realm of possibility that some outside third party might try to influence your decision in this case.

If you get any overture of any type from anyone that you are not comfortable with in any way while you're serving as a juror in this case, you should immediately inform Ms. Clendening. She will advise me, and the Court will deal with it. I don't think it's likely, but it's within the realm of possibility, so I need to call it to your attention.

One other thing, ladies and gentlemen, during the course of the trial, you'll be coming in the mornings and

leaving in the afternoons, there will be breaks and 12:26:42 1 12:26:44 recesses, it's entirely possible, in fact it's probable, that at some point you're going to pass in close proximity, 12:26:48 3 12:26:50 one of these lawyers, one of the witnesses, one of the corporate representatives connected with this case, either 12:26:53 5 12:26:55 in the hallway, on the front steps, somewhere in and around this courthouse. 12:27:01 7 12:27:01 When that happens, they're not going to speak to 8 They're not going to smile and say good morning. 12:27:06 you. They're not going to be friendly and gregarious, as we 12:27:08 10 11 often are in East Texas. That's because I've instructed 12:27:12 12:27:15 12 them not to, and that's because you are not to have any 12:27:18 13 communications of any type with anyone that would influence you in any way and that would bring anything to bear other 12:27:21 14 12:27:27 15 than the sworn testimony that you receive in open court during the trial and the exhibits that I admit into 12:27:30 16 evidence. 12:27:33 17 It all goes back -- most of the instructions 12:27:33 18 you're going to hear from me go back to that same bedrock 12:27:36 19 12:27:40 20 principle that the sole source of the only information that you should have to draw upon in answering the questions 12:27:43 21 22 that will be in the verdict at the end of this trial must 12:27:46 12:27:50 23 be limited to what is given in open court under oath by way 12:27:55 24 of testimony that's subject to cross-examination and the

12:27:58 25

exhibits that the Court admits into evidence by ruling of

the Court under the Federal Rules of Evidence. That's it, 12:28:02 1 12:28:04 ladies and gentlemen. 12:28:05 And we must be diligent, all of us, to make sure 3 that there's nothing from any other source that comes into 12:28:09 your minds or your presence as a part of this trial. 12:28:11 12:28:15 That's why you're going to hear that instruction from me over and over, and that's why if you smile at 7 12:28:17 somebody first thing in the morning and they're related to 12:28:21 12:28:23 one of these parties, they're not going to smile back, they're not going to speak, they're not going to ask you, 12:28:25 10 12:28:28 did you have a good night? They're not going to say 11 12:28:31 12 anything. Don't hold that against them when that happens. 12:28:32 13 Don't think they're being rude or unfriendly. They're 12:28:35 14 12:28:37 15 simply following the Court's instruction all related back to that fundamental principle that I've mentioned to you. 12:28:42 16 17 Also, so you'll know, over the course of the 12:28:44 18 trial, it's been my experience that jurors in our part of 12:28:48 the country would rather work longer days each day and be 12:28:51 19 12:28:55 20 away from their homes and their families and their 21 businesses a shorter number of days. There are places in 12:28:57 the United States where in federal court they start at 12:29:03 22 10:00 o'clock in the morning, and they stop at 3:30 or 4:00 12:29:05 23 12:29:08 24 o'clock in the afternoon. But instead of five days to try this case, it will take 10 or 15 days to try this case. 12:29:12 25

We're not going to do that. We're going to start at 8:30 every morning, and we will go at least until 5:30 or 6:00 o'clock each evening. If we've got a witness on the witness stand that has 15 or 20 more minutes before they're finished and it's 6:00 o'clock, we may go until 6:20 or 6:15.

I want you to be aware that my practice and the one I think is most acceptable to the largest number of people in our part of the country is we'd much rather be gone from home and work a shorter number of days but work each day a longer number of hours. So that's the approach that I typically take, and that's the approach we'll take in this case.

So beginning tomorrow morning, I will need you in the jury room present and assembled and ready to go by 8:30 which means you need to get here a little bit before 8:30 each morning.

And we will typically take a recess somewhere between an hour and a half and two hours each part of the day, and then we'll have a recess for lunch each day.

You also need to know that I ordered the government -- the clerk's office to provide your lunch to you each day in the jury room. So lunch is going to be brought to you in the jury room each day. You're not going to need to leave and go find a place to eat. Especially

12:29:18 12:29:22 12:29:27 12:29:30 12:29:30 7 12:29:33 12:29:36 12:29:41 12:29:44 10 12:29:48 11 12:29:51 12 12:29:53 13 12:29:54 14

12:29:16

1

12:29:57 15 12:30:00 16 12:30:04 17

12:30:09 19 12:30:14 20

18

21

12:30:05

12:30:20

12:30:22 22 12:30:24 23

12:30:27 24

12:30:30 25

those of you that are not familiar with Marshall, that will save us a lot of time and allow us to move the process through quicker so that we can finish within the time estimate that I gave you during jury selection, and hopefully have a verdict in hand and the case finished sometime on Friday of this week.

All right. Ladies and gentlemen, at this time, I'm going to excuse you for lunch. It should be in the jury room waiting for you.

Again, do not discuss or communicate about this case in any way with anyone, and we'll have you back after lunch, at which time I will give you my preliminary instructions, we'll hear opening statements from the lawyers, and then after the opening statements, we'll get on to the evidence.

After the opening statements, the Plaintiff will call their witnesses, put on their evidence, which is called the Plaintiff's case-in-chief. Then when they have finished with that, they will rest their case-in-chief, and the Defendants will put on their evidence and call their witnesses and present the Defendant's case-in-chief.

Then when the Defendants have called all their witnesses and presented all their evidence, the Defendant will rest their case-in-chief.

When the Defendant rests its case-in-chief, then

12:30:33 12:30:36 3 12:30:38 12:30:41 12:30:45 7 12:30:46 12:30:54 12:30:57 12:31:00 10 12:31:03 11 12:31:07 12 12:31:11 13 12:31:13 14 12:31:16 15 12:31:18 16 17

12:30:30

1

12:31:20 12:31:23 18 12:31:26 19 12:31:30 20 12:31:33 21

12:31:40 23

22

12:31:37

12:31:42 24

12:31:44 25

12:31:47

12:31:50

12:31:52

12:31:57

12:32:00

12:32:02

12:32:04

12:32:09

12:32:11

12:32:15

12:32:17

12:32:20

12:32:24

12:32:27

12:32:30

12:32:34

12:32:36

12:32:38

12:32:43

12:32:46

12:32:50

12:32:51

12:32:55

12:32:59

12:33:02 25

1

3

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

the Plaintiff will have an opportunity to call what are called rebuttal witnesses. I don't know whether the Plaintiff will or not, but at that point, if they have rebuttal witnesses, they will put them on. And when the Plaintiff's rebuttal witnesses have all testified, then you will have heard all the evidence in the case.

And at that point, I will give you my final instructions on the law that you are to apply. This is sometimes called the Court's charge to the jury.

After I've given you those final instructions, then counsel for both Plaintiff and Defendant will present their closing arguments to you. And when you've heard your -- heard the closing arguments, when that's complete and after I have completed any final instructions, then I will instruct you to retire to the jury room and considering all the evidence, deliberate on the verdict that you're going to return in this case.

At that point, but not until, it will become your obligation and duty to discuss among the eight of you the evidence that you've heard in your attempt to arrive at a unanimous verdict in this case.

So that's how the structure of the trial will go.

Preliminary instructions, opening statements, Plaintiff's

case-in-chief, Defendant's case-in-chief, Plaintiff's

rebuttal case, final instructions from the Court, closing

arguments from the lawyers, then you will retire to 12:33:06 1 deliberate on the verdict. That's a thumbnail structural 12:33:09 sketch of how the trial will go over the next week. 12:33:13 3 All right. Ladies and gentlemen, with those 12:33:16 4 instructions, again reminding you not to discuss the case 12:33:17 5 12:33:20 in any way, you're excused to the jury room for lunch, 7 which should be waiting for you there. 12:33:23 COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise. 12:33:25 8 (Jury out.) 12:33:26 9 THE COURT: Be seated, please. 12:33:53 10 12:33:53 Counsel, this morning in chambers we met and 11 reviewed objections to certain demonstratives and other 12:34:00 12 issues that would arise during opening statements. At that 12:34:04 13 point, there seemed to be an agreement worked out among 12:34:06 14 Plaintiff and Defendant concerning the issue of Doctrine of 12:34:09 15 Equivalents. And I indicated to you in chambers that once 12:34:15 16 we had the jury selected but outside their presence, I 12:34:18 17 would ask you to put that agreement on the record. 12:34:21 18 12:34:23 19 Are you prepared to do that? 12:34:29 20 MS. GLASSER: Your Honor, we had presented a proposal to the Defendants. If they're amenable to it, we 12:34:31 21 12:34:34 22 can read it into the record or print it out for Your Honor. 12:34:37 23 MR. BITTNER: Your Honor, we do have a slight 12:34:39 24 counterproposal. We just got it a few minutes ago. I can speak with Ms. Glasser over the break. I believe that we 12:34:42 25

```
12:34:45
        1 can reach an agreement.
                    THE COURT: All right. You all -- I -- I gather
12:34:46
           you don't think this is an insurmountable difference,
12:34:50
           Mr. Bittner?
12:34:54
                    MR. BITTNER: I do not.
12:34:55
         5
12:34:56
                    THE COURT: I'll let you all discuss it over the
        6
            lunch break, and then before I bring the jury back in, I'll
        7
12:34:58
            expect to hear something to announce into the record at
12:35:02
12:35:05
           that time.
       9
                    MS. GLASSER: What would Your Honor's preference
12:35:05 10
           be as to the reading of it? Is it something that the Court
12:35:06
       11
           will do or -- or the parties?
12:35:07 12
12:35:08
       13
                    THE COURT: No, I'll probably ask you to read it
           into the record, and then ask the other side to confirm
12:35:11 14
           that that's accurate.
12:35:13 15
                    MS. GLASSER: Thank you, Your Honor.
12:35:15 16
                    THE COURT: All right. Are there -- is either
12:35:16 17
           side aware of anything else we need to take up before we
12:35:19
       18
           break for lunch?
12:35:21
       19
12:35:23 20
                    MR. SHEASBY: Your Honor, there is one issue,
           which is Defendants have asked for a short instruction to
12:35:25 21
12:35:28 22
           be given. There are -- there is video plays this afternoon
12:35:31 23
           that have been agreed to. The Defendants have asked for a
12:35:33 24
           short instruction to be given, given context of video
           plays. We're in the process of agreeing to that. And my
12:35:36 25
```

```
expectation is that when we come back after lunch, we'll
12:35:39
         1
12:35:43
            present that proposed instruction to the jury on video
12:35:45
            plays.
        3
                     THE COURT: All right. Well, again, I'll direct
12:35:46
            that you meet and confer about that over the lunch hour,
12:35:47
        5
12:35:50
            and we'll see where we are after lunch is completed but
12:35:53 7
            before I bring the jury back in.
                     MR. SHEASBY: Thank you, Your Honor.
12:35:55
        8
12:35:56
                     THE COURT: Anything from Defendant at this
         9
            juncture?
12:35:57 10
12:35:57
       11
                     MR. MELSHEIMER: No, Your Honor.
                     THE COURT: We stand in recess for lunch.
12:35:58 12
12:36:00 13
                     I'll plan to be back on the bench by 1:30.
                     COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.
12:36:06 14
12:36:06 15
                    (Recess.)
01:06:45 16
        17
        18
        19
        20
        21
        22
        23
        24
        25
```

CERTIFICATION I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript from the stenographic notes of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter to the best of my ability. /S/ Shelly Holmes 1/6/2020 SHELLY HOLMES, CSR, TCRR Date OFFICIAL REPORTER State of Texas No.: 7804 Expiration Date: 12/31/20